

# CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

July — September 1958

LONDON

S · P · C · K

1958

*Published by S.P.C.K.  
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by  
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

# CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Professor Leonard  
Hodgson, D.D.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer,  
Bishop of Exeter.

The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott,  
Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

## EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

---

## CONTENTS

### EDITORIAL

SIR EDWYN HOSKYNs ON JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH *J. O. Cobham*  
ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN RELATIONS *W. Templeton Moore*  
DR MASCALL AND THE ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN REPORT

*H. E. W. Turner*

TITLES OF THE ROMAN SEE *H. Burn-Murdoch*  
ECUMENICITY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY *Richard Parsons*  
REASON WITHOUT REVELATION *T. H. Croxall*  
CHRISTIAN IDEOLOGY AND THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS

*W. Montgomery Watt*

EVANGELICAL PARISH CLERGY, 1820-1840 *Arthur Pollard*  
RELIGIOUS CONVERSION IN THE CONTEXT OF PASTORAL WORK  
*Owen R. Brandon*

THE ROYAL STOLE: AN INQUIRY *E. H. Burgmann*  
THE USE OF A UNIVERSITY *Norman Sykes*  
CORRESPONDENCE

### REVIEWS

*A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.*

## REVIEWS

- JOHN A. T. ROBINSON: *Jesus and his Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine.* By J. S. Bezzant
- T. F. TORRANCE: *When Christ Comes and Comes Again.* By J. S. Bezzant
- G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY: *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen.* By G. W. H. Lampe
- NEIL Q. HAMILTON: *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul.* By the Editor
- R. H. PFEIFFER: *The Books of the Old Testament.* By J. Robinson
- GERALD VANN, O.P., and P. K. MEAGHER, O.P.: *Stones or Bread?* By Kenneth N. Ross
- C. F. WHITLEY: *The Exilic Age.* By J. Robinson
- F. F. BRUCE: *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* By U. E. Simon
- BRUCE M. METZGER: *An Introduction to the Apocrypha.* By U. E. Simon
- JEANNIE B. THOMSON DAVIES: *The Heart of the Bible.* By G. J. Inglis
- F. L. CROSS (ed.): *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* By G. W. H. Lampe
- HAMILTON HESS: *The Canons of the Council of Sardica.* By the Editor
- R. P. LAWSON (tr. and ed.): *Origen: The Song of Songs.* By S. L. Greenslade
- MARTIN WERNER: *The Formation of Christian Dogma.* By H. E. W. Turner
- WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.: *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria.* By E. I. Watkin
- JOSEF PIEPER: *The Silence of St Thomas: Three Essays.* By Frederic Hood
- P. J. ALEXANDER: *Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire.* By H. M. Waddams
- MARTIN LUTHER (tr. J. I. PACKER and O. R. JOHNSTON): *The Bondage of the Will.* By James Atkinson
- R. H. FIFE: *The Revolt of Martin Luther.* By Thomas M. Parker
- HENRY J. CADBURY: *Quakerism and Early Christianity.* By H. G. G. Herklots



## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Venerable J. O. COBHAM is Archdeacon of Durham and a Canon Residentiary of Durham Cathedral.

The Reverend W. TEMPLETON MOORE is Assistant Curate of St James', Forest Gate, London, E.7.

The Reverend Canon H. E. W. TURNER, D.D., is Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham and a Canon Residentiary of Durham Cathedral.

The late Dr H. BURN-MURDOCH was a noted authority on ecclesiastical history and law and was the author, among other books, of *The Development of the Papacy* (1954).

The Reverend M. R. PARSONS, B.D., is Rector of Acton, London, W.3.

The late Reverend T. H. CROXALL, D.D., was Chaplain at Copenhagen from 1947 to 1955, and was an authority on Kierkegaard.

The Reverend W. MONTGOMERY WATT, PH.D., is head of the Department of Arabic in the University of Edinburgh and is the author of a standard work on the life of Muhammad.

Mr ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Manchester.

The Reverend O. R. BRANDON is Tutor and Librarian at the London College of Divinity and Lecturer in Theology and the Psychology of Religion.

The Right Reverend E. H. BURGMANN is Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn.

The Reverend NORMAN SYKES, D.D., D.PHIL., F.B.A., is Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge. His appointment to the Deanery of Winchester has recently been announced.

- VLADIMIR LOSSKY: *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* By Austin Oakley
- J. I. KOTSONIS: *The Canonical View of Intercommunion with those not of the Orthodox Faith and Problems of "Ecclesiastical Economy".* By Austin Oakley
- HUGH MARTIN (ed.): *The Private Prayers of Lancelot Andrewes.* By George M. Bosworth
- GEORGE HERBERT: *The Country Parson and Selected Poems.* By Gordon Huelin
- A. TINDAL HART: *The Eighteenth Century Country Parson.* By Gordon Huelin
- LOUIS BOUYER: *Newman, his Life and Spirituality.* By George Every, S.S.M.
- BURDETTE C. POLAND: *French Protestantism and the French Revolution.* By R. W. Greaves
- N. V. PIERCE-BUTLER: *A Book of British Saints.* By Gordon Huelin
- PHILIP W. LILLEY: *Athletes of the Spirit.* By Gordon Huelin

## EDITORIAL

NO ONE can justifiably complain that the Church of England is at the moment keeping silent about herself. Perhaps it was the imminence of another Lambeth Conference that opened the floodgates of publicity, but certain it is that the stream is in spate and that the books and pamphlets pouring out from the press are almost embarrassing in their multiplicity. Two sizeable volumes stand out and attract attention amid the flood: one by the Archdeacon of Hastings, *The Church of England, its Members and its Business*<sup>1</sup>, and the other by the editor of the Church of England newspaper, *The New Church in the New Age*<sup>2</sup>. Both are admirable in their respective ways. Both are a complete contrast to each other. Both agree in one grave indictment, and in that we believe they are wrong.

Guy Mayfield, as becomes an Archdeacon, gives us a very solid blue-book. It is a first-rate volume of reference and tells you nearly everything you can ever want to know about the church of this country. There are one or two points that should be put right for a second edition. The Archdeacon should find out who really does say prayers in the House of Lords. Is it true that the Bishops "authorized" the use of the 1928 book in their dioceses? Does the Prime Minister's "secretariat" really assist the Lord Chancellor in all matters of ecclesiastical patronage exercised by the Crown? And is the patronage of *all* St Paul's canonries vested in the Crown? However no one could expect to get a book like this completely right in every detail at the first effort. One hopes there will be many editions, each with the help of careful and knowledgeable readers mounting nearer to perfection.

The Reverend C. O. Rhodes, as becomes a newspaper man, gives us a very different kind of book. It is a quite brilliant piece of journalism. Even when it drives you to fury, you don't put it down. True, one wishes that there were fewer echoes of old unhappy controversies from the columns of his church weekly and that the subject of divorce were not so much of a King Charles's head, but

<sup>1</sup> O.U.P., 18s.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert Jenkins, 21s.



the author flings his flail quite indiscriminately and even if it sometimes catches oneself it at least makes one sit up and take notice. The situations to which the author draws attention are well worth noticing, sometimes for praise, sometimes for blame, and sometimes for honest query. Naturally there is a good deal of loose talk as there must be inevitably in this kind of book—"the Church must be prepared to revolutionize itself and even to break itself up in order to meet this situation"—but occasionally, as in the suggestions for a new synthesis, a new sacramentalism, a new way of reading the Bible, we get something both striking and helpful.

---

What then is the point on which two such diverse books are in agreement and on which we think they are wrong? They put down what they believe to be the present *malaise* in the Church to a lack of leadership. In the last resort it is the bishops who are to blame for everything. That of course is particularly naughty of the arch-deacon both because he is the bishop's eye and also because he has already proved to his own satisfaction that there is nothing very much wrong with the Church. And in any case are not archdeacons themselves to be numbered among the Church's leaders?

This kind of complaint comes better from Mr Rhodes, and, to be candid, he makes it sound more effective. Both writers complain that the bishops are becoming too monarchical, and Mr Rhodes actually lists twenty-two provisions in the draft canons conferring powers on the bishops. But he is still wrong. It is quite a mistake to think that diocesan bishops are acquiring a whole body of new powers. For the most part even the new provisions merely give formal recognition to powers that have always been regarded as inherent in the episcopal office. The fact that they are now more clearly defined suggests not expansion but limitation. In fact it would be quite easy to set up an opposite thesis to that laid down in these two books and to claim that the modern diocesan is so hemmed about with boards and committees that he has not only lost all the time he ever had but also all his freedom of action. For good or evil the episcopate has been put into commission.

The gravamen of the complaint is apparently that in return for this alleged expansion of their powers the bishops are giving no adequate leadership. One would have thought that the charge was almost self-contradictory. But is it true that the bishops are giving no leadership? Where precisely are they failing? The one great

failure of the Church in this country is to capture the proletariat for Christ. But that is no more and no less the fault of the bishops than of every Church member, clerical or lay. In general it must be said, in fairness to a body of men who in this matter cannot speak for themselves, that the Church of England has to-day as fine a team of diocesans as it has had in the whole course of its history. One can, thank God, point to individual giants in other generations, but the average standard of devotion and efficiency has never been higher than it is to-day. In this respect the bench of bishops faithfully reflects, as except in quite abnormal conditions it always does, the standard of the clergy as a whole.

In any case no good was ever done by complaining of a lack of leadership. It only serves to undermine confidence in such leadership as exists. Luckily the bulk of the clergy estimate this kind of talk at its true value, give a good-natured shrug, and save their breath for the task of following the leaders, whom individually they revere.

---

Professor Riesenfeld's address delivered at the opening session of the Oxford Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" and now published by Mowbrays at half-a-crown under the title *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginning* is important for its attempt to take the ultimate step in tracing back the evangelical tradition to its source. In common with most modern scholars the Professor accepts the view that behind the documents that were drawn upon for our present gospels there was an oral tradition that expressed itself in various "forms". He refuses however to agree that these forms were derived from pagan sources. Whatever models they followed they were in effect the class instruction given by the apostles and other leaders to the faithful members of Christian congregations. They were no doubt learnt individually by rote, but together they formed the doctrine or teaching in which the Christian account of the revelation through Christ was condensed and handed down to the next generation. But where did the Apostles get them? Where indeed, asks the Professor, but from Christ himself? We have long been accustomed to think of the apostolic teacher sitting with his circle of pupils around him going over those paradigms again and again until they reached a stereotyped form that could be committed almost without alteration to writing. Now we are invited to see Jesus fulfilling this rôle himself. This seems easy enough to do so



long as we are concerned only with the *teaching* of Christ, but it is much more difficult to envisage when we come to the action narratives. No doubt some, like the Temptation story, came from his own lips, but are we seriously to think of Jesus repeating over and over again stories of the way in which he healed the sick, cleansed the leper, raised the dead? Surely here there is room for the eye-witness, and if for the eye-witness, then for all the discrepancies and divergencies to which eye-witnesses' narratives are proverbially subject. We fear that after all the Professor's attempt to isolate the source of the earliest tradition is no more than the penultimate step. But for that, so far as it goes, we are still grateful.

---

One of the more serious losses we seemed likely to incur through the demise of the old C.S.S.S. was the annotated book list, which was so invaluable to the serious reader. We are happily able to announce that in order to prevent this disaster S.P.C.K. has undertaken responsibility for its future publication and that Dr Eric Mascall has consented to continue as its editor. The first two issues will be sent out at a six months' interval as a free insert in *View-Review*. It is hoped that after that period a sufficient number of readers will be found willing to pay the cost of producing a book-list every six months and having it posted to them.

**Sir Edwyn Hoskyns**  
**on**  
**JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH:**  
**His course of sermons on "The XXXIX Articles"**

J. O. COBHAM

I

IT WAS the custom of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns as Dean of Chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, to preach each year a course of sermons, three sermons in the Michaelmas Term and three in the Lent Term, followed sometimes by one or sometimes two in the Easter Term, concerning the Doctrine of the Church of England. In the Introductory Sermon to his famous course on the Homilies he said:

I have . . . now for many years taken as my subject some part of the Library which as laymen you have, or are supposed to have in your hands—I mean, the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, and the Hymn Books.

And he went on to speak of the Book of Homilies as a book to which reference is made both in the Articles and in the Book of Common Prayer, a book which you have not in your hands and with which you are presumably unfamiliar, but which seems to me nevertheless to be not unimportant at the present time.

Four of these courses of sermons, a course on "Eschatology", a course on "Sin", a course on "The Vocabulary of the New Testament—the Language of the Church", the course on "The Homilies", and an isolated sermon on "The Importance of the Parker Manuscripts in the College Library", were published after Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' death in a volume entitled *Cambridge Sermons* (S.P.C.K., 1938) edited by Canon Charles Smyth. Already no doubt a generation has arisen unfamiliar with this volume: but at least these sermons of Hoskyns have been published. In this paper I

propose to deal with one course of sermons by Hoskyns which Canon Smyth seems originally to have selected for inclusion, but in the end decided to omit. It is Hoskyns' course on "The XXXIX Articles". Just why Canon Smyth decided against this particular course, I do not know. Presumably the publishers allowed him so many pages, and something had to go. This course belongs to the same group as the course on "The Homilies" and the sermon on the Parker Manuscripts, but the subject of "The Homilies" had about it an element of novelty as a subject which the XXXIX Articles lacked, while considerable personal research lay behind the sermon on the Parker Manuscripts. None the less it would indeed be unfortunate if this course of sermons on the XXXIX Articles were forgotten, for Hoskyns approaches these Articles with a freshness, with an insight, and with an enthusiasm that was certainly unusual between the wars, and that remains unusual to-day. For this reason I propose to quote from the sermons at length.

The precise date when this course was given is not certainly known. Hoskyns unfortunately did not note on his papers the date and place of their delivery. Someone else has pencilled in the cover paper "? Oct, 1929". The hand is not that either of Hoskyns himself or of Charles Smyth. But, if the guess is right, this course was given in the Chapel of Corpus Christi College during the Academic Year 1929-30. Dr K. Riches, Bishop of Lincoln, however, who was reading Theology under Hoskyns' supervision from 1927 to 1931, and heard the course, told me that he thought the sermons must have been delivered in the year 1930-1.

## 2

In his Introductory Sermon Hoskyns said :

The Christian religion is less concerned with belief in the soul than it is with belief in the body.<sup>1</sup> Throughout its history many

<sup>1</sup> William Temple in *Nature, Man and God* (p. 478) wrote : "It may safely be said that one ground for the hope of Christianity that it may make good its claim to be the true faith lies in the fact that it is the most avowedly materialist of all the great religions." The fundamental point is the same. Hoskyns' sermon, however, was preached not only before *Nature, Man and God* was published in 1935, but also before the Gifford Lectures were delivered 1932-3 and 1933-4. There is in fact no ground for suspecting that either is dependent on the thought of the other. Both have of course a common source in the New Testament and in the history of the formulation of Christian doctrine.

attempts have been made to dissociate Christianity from the concrete world in which we live, and to refine it until it concerns only those rare souls who hardly live in this world at all. This refining and etherialising process is in the end a denial of the Christian Religion, because its supreme revelation is that God manifests Himself in the rough and tumble of human life, and that our ultimate destiny emerges from this rough and tumble. Consequently, if you read the thirty-nine articles, you are not reading a theological discourse spun out of the quiet reflective brains of men removed from the world. You are reading statements wrung out of controversy; no, more than that, wrung passionately out of complete insecurity of life, and written in the blood of men.

Later Hoskyns continued:

There are few men who do not desire to be freed from responsibility, few who do not toy with the notion that character can be built up without intelligence, or that intelligence can be theirs without moral endeavour. Few of us do not wish that our successors may be permitted to live without struggle or the possibility of failure. And, here is the point, it is the Christian Religion which most surely forbids this easy optimism, and sets us most firmly to our varied tasks with the promise that in the struggle and in the insecurity lies the reward of the knowledge of God and the hope of eternal life.

All this may seem very wide of an introduction to a discourse upon the XXXIX Articles. But it is not so, at least I think not so. When the Articles were finally formulated the English Church and State had been and still was insecure, and this insecurity pressed hard upon the leaders in Church and State. They were thrown back upon the Christian Religion in their insecurity, and it is this uncertainty of human life which gives so many of the articles which they formulated sufficient authority over us, at least to cause us to examine seriously their considered judgments, and this is especially the case with those articles which most clearly reflect the tribulation of the times, I mean Articles IX-XVIII, containing the continued repetition of the avowal of human inadequacy, "man is very far gone from original righteousness" Art. IX, "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith,

and not for our own works or deservings" Art. XI, or the title of Article XV "Of Christ alone without sin", or the poignant cry of faith at the conclusion of Article XVIII "Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved".

Have we so little sympathy with our ancestors or so little knowledge of the deep scepticism concerning men and women which reverberates through the literature of our own day, so little understanding of the Christian Religion and of the Church, to be unable to perceive the turmoil which lies behind the evident sincerity of these articles? And have we no desire to possess something of the faith which supported them in their humiliation, and which they intended the Church of England to foster not merely in their own generation, but in the generations which were to come, that is in you and me?

### 3

In thus drawing attention to the insecurity of human life, Hoskyns does, I am certain, give us the right key with which to approach the Articles and the doctrines they were concerned to emphasize. The sixteenth century was deeply conscious of this insecurity. Listen for example to the magnificent Elizabethan Preface of 1562 to the re-published first Book of Homilies:

Considering how necessary it is, that the Word of God, which is the only food of the Soul, and that most excellent Light that we must walk by, in this our most dangerous Pilgrimage, should at all convenient times be preached unto the People, that thereby they may both learn their Duty towards God, their Prince, and their Neighbors, according to the mind of the Holy Ghost, expressed in the Scriptures: And also to avoid the manifold enormities which heretofore by false Doctrine have crept into the Church of God: And how that all they which are appointed Ministers, have not the gift of Preaching sufficiently to instruct the People, which is committed unto them, whereof great inconveniences might rise, and ignorance still be maintained, if some honest remedy be not found and provided.

The sixteenth century was deeply conscious that the life of mortal man was a "most dangerous Pilgrimage" and the dangers



were such that they threatened not only his temporal welfare but also his eternal destiny.

For us life is no less a "most dangerous Pilgrimage" but we do our best to banish the awareness of the fact from our minds. In two ways at least we have indeed reduced the threat to life: medical science and our whole standard of living have increased our expectation of life: the secularism of our age and the liberal stress upon the love of God have almost if not entirely banished the fear of Hell. And yet we have only done this to find ourselves confronted by new dangers. Health and length of life are threatened by, amongst other dangers, the increase of cancer. Our very existence as a race is threatened by the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, the cobalt bomb.

In the *Spectator* for 20 January 1956 was published Charles Curran's remarkable and provocative article on "The New Estate in Great Britain". By "The New Estate" Charles Curran meant the new class composed of manual workers who are the principle beneficiaries under the Welfare State. He wrote:

One word sums up the New Estate: the word "security". It is security in working-class terms, maintained and enforced by working-class methods.

Towards the end of the article he wrote:

It is the reading matter of the New Estate that gives the key to its state of mind. It buys newspapers and weekly periodicals in large numbers; and nearly all of them . . . display one characteristic in common. They exploit the tabloid method of presentation . . .

It can now be seen that when the bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 the fall-out started something like a genetic mutation in the minds of large sections of the British people. They received an apocalyptic shock. Fear, helpless and bewildering, struck deep into them. Year by year since then, atomic and nuclear developments have driven it deeper still.

Nowhere was the shock more severe than among the manual workers of the New Estate; for it coincided with the achievement of all the security for which they had been struggling over three generations. No sooner had the goal been reached than the foundations began to rock. Escape from fear became a clamorous

psychological necessity. The tabloid is an exact response to that demand. . . . They offer a simple, cheerful, manageable universe, a warm cosy place of sex, excitement, triviality and fantasy.

I have quoted enough of Charles Curran, though there is much more. But the contrast between our own age, if he is right, and that of the first Elizabethans is striking. They knew that life was a "most dangerous Pilgrimage" and prepared themselves for it. Our age is not unaware of the danger but turns its back upon it, and enters the By-path-Meadow of social security.

## 4

But let us return to Hoskyns. His second sermon was on "The Anti-Roman element in the Articles."

Before however he treated of this element he uttered a most serious warning:

When the historical nature of our Christian documents is recognised, a modern heresy of great magnitude appears and runs its dangerous course. If the O.T. be the record of great moments in the history of the Hebrews, if the N.T. be descriptive of a religious movement in the Roman Empire, if the Creeds be grounded upon controversies which took place in the 3rd and 4th centuries, and the Articles upon controversies in the 16th century, then they may be venerable documents, but they can have no authority in the 20th century. They emerged from a period of past history, and so these venerable authorities are either just neglected by men in their modernity, or they endeavour to extract from these damaged authorities some attenuated value or significance which is then substituted for the full blooded history and for its "literal and grammatical sense". It is interesting to notice that in the Royal Declaration by which the Articles are prefaced this whole procedure of attenuating interpretation is forbidden. "No man hereafter shall either print, or preach, or draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article" Par. 6. Now this declaratory preface does not, as is often supposed, merely introduce a disciplinary regulation: it is the charter of ecclesiastical intelligence, for it imposes upon those who hold any authority in the Church, and by implication also upon those who

are instructed by them, a most severe historical discipline. We are not permitted to bend our documents this way and that in order that they may correspond with our own whims and fancies, or in order that they may be made acceptable to this or that trend of public opinion. These Articles have a precise meaning of their own, which it is for us to discover, and in that meaning is set something more than a truth for a particular generation. In the history selected for their instruction and our edification God has revealed Himself. That is the claim which justifies so rigorous an attention to the historical meaning of the Bible, the Creeds, and also of the Articles of Religion.

This is, it seems to me, an exceedingly important warning, and Hoskyns developed it at length. It is important first of all for our preaching, for preaching is the exposition of Holy Scripture, and when we enter the pulpit and invoke the name of God, we do well to tremble lest we fail to submit our words to "the plain and full meaning" of our text, or commit the blasphemy of putting our "own sense or comment to be the meaning" thereof. But it applies also to the Creeds and to the Articles for these venerable documents have issued from our particular authoritative history.

But to return to Hoskyns' sermon :

And so we come to that element in the Articles which has caused such pleasure to some and such horror to others. I mean the anti-Roman Articles and the anti-Roman phrases in the Articles, which occur most frequently in the so-called "Calvinistic" Articles IX-XVIII and in Articles XIX and XXII with which these sermons are mainly concerned. The attack upon the "School-authors", that is upon the dominating orthodoxy of mediaeval Theology, and the definite statement "The Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith," or "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques is (N.B. the grammatical structure of the sentence) *The Romish doctrine* concerning these things is a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." All this attack upon medievalism may encourage a most barren controversy in some or may cause in others a deep sense of unfairness towards the Catholic religion. I would ask

you not to judge too quickly, but to ask What are these Articles really attacking? These apparently controversial statements are wrestling with a great truth which is emerging in the controversy, and if the form of them is influenced by Calvinistic language—Well, what is it which they are in fact saying?

At the moment all I wish to emphasise is that the moment we have said that the Church is in the world but not of it, and when we say that it is an act of God for our salvation, we must at once take it all back again by the clear recognition that the Church at any given moment may be untrue to its vocation and stand not only in the world but of it. It is to this possible apostasy which our attention is drawn in the Articles. We can never be the slaves of the Church for our profit unless it is controlled by the N.T., i.e. by the Gospel of God.

## 5

In the third sermon Hoskyns developed this theme of the possibility of the apostasy of the Church. He said :

The whole sincerity of the Articles presumes the Church to be The Church of God set in the world for the salvation of men. In Article XX it is stated to have "authority in Controversies of Faith", it is "*testis et conservatrix divinatorum librorum*—witness and keeper of the Holy Scriptures". In it, as is asserted in Art. XIX, the "pure Word of God is preached" and the Sacraments are duly administered. Great care is required that the Archbishops and Bishops the Priests and Deacons be "rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered" (Art. XXXVI). And the reason is clearly set forth in Art. XXVI. They in no wise act "in their own name" but in the name of Christ and by his commission and authority. Consequently the efficacy of their ministry is the efficacy of the word of God and of the Sacraments instituted and promised by Christ. The efficacy of their ministry rests upon their consecration and ordering, and not upon their personal ability or worthiness. The authority of the Word of God declared in the Church and the effect of the Sacraments is then neither disturbed nor hindered even though "they be ministered by evil men" (Art. XXVI). This is no doubt a very hard saying, but it utters a recognition of the authority of the Church in ministering to the salvation of men beyond which it is hardly possible to go.

And yet all this language is crossed by a terrible and palpitating fear; a fear so intense that it springs clearly from no abstract or theoretic speculation. It is a fear which springs from a concrete and vivid experience of what is felt to be a great apostasy, not an apostasy of this or that man, but an ecclesiastical apostasy—a corruption of the Church. In describing this apostasy the words error, superstition, arrogancy, impiety, and the phrases “repugnant to the Word of God” “a fond thing vainly invented” “grounded upon no warranty of Scripture” “corrupt following of the Apostles” are used not carelessly and in anger, but with considered intention and judgement.

There is the paradox concerning the Church, and it certainly requires explanation. We are not free to impose an explanation upon the Articles, to be satisfied by saying that these terrible phrases reflect the revolt from the tyranny of Rome of a group of leading Englishmen holding high office, and to find in dignified patriotism the motive for their use. No doubt there is patriotism in our Articles, but it is that patriotism which seeks the protection of England less from the tyranny of Rome than from the tyranny of sin. Nor can we explain the language merely by using the word “superstition”. We are easily accustomed to declare that to be superstitious of which we do not approve or with which we are unfamiliar. The question is not what we may understand by “superstition” but what the Articles mean by it. I very much doubt whether modern anti-Catholic opinions help us very much in understanding the experienced fear which runs through the Articles of Religion.

No, if we are to understand the Articles we must go to the Articles themselves. The trouble about the Articles is that they are so desperately, so shockingly, Christian, and that they cling so tenaciously to Christian truth and utter their judgements in the light of it. It is the language they use about human merit and about works which do not spring out of faith in Christ, about human sin, about the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, about Justification by Faith, which requires understanding before ever we can understand their fear of the apostasy of the Church.

It is not the fear of invasion, not the fear of foreign interference with the civil or ecclesiastical courts, not the draining of money from England to the continent, not even the immorality of the clergy which chiefly underlies our Articles. It is fear lest



the power of the Word of God may be obscured by human activity and lest the Church may proclaim its own merit rather than the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and may become the centre and focus of human ability and morality and industry rather than the organ of the mighty works of God. The Articles represent a Christian revolt undertaken in the name of the Christian Church against the human energy of the later medieval church which had penetrated with its influence both its doctrine and its practice. It is against the magnificent tribute which the medieval church bore to the achievements of her sons, whether saints or philosophers, that the Articles are protesting in the name of the Christian Religion.

When the Church permits the devotion of the faithful to exhaust itself or to kindle its energy in the recognition of the "merits" of its saints or in the all embracing wisdom of its philosophers it moves towards blasphemy, for the function of the Church is to proclaim only the righteousness of God and His wisdom. This means the exclusion neither of the saints nor of the theologians from her piety, but it does define sanctity primarily in terms of humility before God, and in terms of sin and the mercy of God, and it does forbid the adoption of a human philosophy, even though it be a Christian Philosophy, as a rigid test of orthodoxy and as capable of providing authentic and final instruction upon all the ramifications of human life in its relation to God.

Now the foundation stone upon which the central Articles—IX-XVIII—are built is to be found in the terrible Article XIII entitled *Of Works Before Justification*:

"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ . . . yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin."

This is a very shameful Article to us who have been so often told that the normal human righteousness and goodness which springs up outside the Church and apart from Christian faith is more noble than that which is discoverable within it, and to whom it has so often been taught that the sooner the church discards its ancient faith and learns to respect the adequacy of that moral uprightness and that passion for social righteousness which

has its origin in the human love which binds right thinking men one to another, and the sooner it learns to respect the adequacy of modern learning, the sooner the Church will attract to itself what is best in human life. The Article, however, demands a precisely opposite judgement. It recognises the good which exists apart from the faith of the Church, and then proceeds to declare its insecurity, and its inadequacy; it has the nature of sin.

Hoskyns sought to illustrate this point from the controversy between orthodox English rowing and the so-called "Jesus style". The representatives of orthodox English rowing did not doubt the pace and efficiency of boats trained in the "Jesus style", but they did not believe that English or any other rowing would be securely based if the "Jesus style" were universally adopted. It had for them the "nature of sin" in spite of its race-winning quality.

Then Hoskyns continued:

But as to the security of a morality independent of Christian faith, it may be doubted whether the scepticism of our Articles as to human merit be not wholly justified. And the scepticism of the Articles goes further than this. They do not only state that human goodness outside the faith of the Church has of itself the nature of sin, but even the righteousness which is grounded in Christian faith is also incomplete and imperfect. There is no moral perfection to be found here on earth even in the saints, though the good works of the faithful are solemnly declared to be pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ (Art. XII). Yet, although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, the Apostle (St Paul) doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin (Art. IX). And so, in this universal scepticism concerning human righteousness, the Articles throw us back upon the righteousness of God in Christ, and permit the word "merit" to be attached only to Him. "We are accounted righteous only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our works or deservings" (Art. XI). Finally we are thrown back upon the words of Jesus to justify these words in the Article "When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants" (quoted at the conclusion of Art. XIV).

In the three sermons of the Michaelmas Term Hoskyns then established two points—I quote from his introduction to his first sermon of the Lent Term :

Now, in the end, these Articles say only two things, though they say them very provocatively. First, they insist that Christian salvation from sin is an act of God, and is not in any sense a human achievement, and that therefore all theological language which moves in terms of human merit is to be discarded as in the end blasphemous, since it deprives God of his initiative. Secondly, they insist that the ground of human salvation is to be found in the name of Christ, and in His name only, that is to say that the action of God for the salvation of men is to be found in the concrete historical event which was Jesus Christ, and is to be found nowhere else. . . . Justification or human life lived according to the will of God is then only possible by faith in the real activity of the living God in history, and that means by faith in Jesus Christ, who was and is, as it were, the Theatre upon which God plays His energetic part before the eyes of men—for their salvation.

What Hoskyns was saying was then that Justification by Faith is not just the subject of one Article but the real point of all the Articles—certainly of the central group Articles IX-XVIII—as it was indeed the central insight of the Reformation.

And he was very conscious that this fundamental insight was threatened in our own day, not so much by the Catholicism against which the Articles hurl their anathemas, not by Anglo-Catholicism in our own Church which is fundamentally Augustinian—though it carries with it a certain body of aesthetes—as in the Humanism, the Theological Liberalism, and the Moralism which dominated the outlook of Cambridge and indeed of the whole country between the wars, and from which we have even now by no means recovered. It was because Hoskyns discerned in Liberalism the true enemy of the religion of the Articles, of the Book of Common Prayer, of the religion of the New Testament, and constantly stated the same, that Cambridge found him so uncomfortable a prophet and tried to dismiss him either as an Anglo-Catholic apologist or as a Barthian. The enigma was that he appeared to be an Anglo-Catholic and a Barthian at one and the same time. How could these things be? It

was not only Cambridge that found this difficult but also continental theologians. Why, the German theologian, standing in a Lutheran or a Reformed tradition, asked, are our contacts with the theologians of the Church of England primarily contacts with the theologians of the wing that is most strange to us—the Anglo-Catholic wing? The positive answer was Hoskyns; the negative that the theologians who called themselves Evangelical, but who had broken with Evangelical Fundamentalism, had come to a greater or less degree under the influence of Liberalism, and were no longer convinced exponents of the Augustinian theological tradition. And in using that word “Augustinian” we come near to the solution of the enigma of Hoskyns. Hoskyns really was rooted in the Augustinian tradition of the Articles and of the Book of Common Prayer, because, behind all this, he was rooted in the theology of the New Testament.

So, in the first two sermons of the Lent Term, Hoskyns set out to show that the theology of the Articles really was the theology of the New Testament. Shall I be very rash if I assume that, a generation later, it is no longer necessary to attempt to prove this? Instead I will just quote the beginning of the fifth Sermon of the whole course:

The Articles of Religion in speaking of Salvation from sin firmly and brutally rule out every notion of human merit. Last Sunday I endeavoured to show that this brutality did not originate with our Articles, since they do but reaffirm the Biblical roughness. When the Church of God was launched upon the turbulent sea of Palestinian Judaism, no man could raise his eyes to her, and cry “Look, there glides into history an achievement which marks the greatness of human intelligence and perseverance”. The Church of God owed its being to an act of God, in which God acted energetically, not through the genius of men, but through their weakness; in order, as St Paul says, that the power might be manifest, that it is of God, and not of ourselves.

And he concluded this sermon by saying:

I want to ask you . . . Whether we shall play our part in England today, by allowing our churches to become opportunities for a merely human fellowship or for mere moral homilies and exhortations to good works, rather than the scenes

of a convinced proclamation of the power of the living God, and for the production of a living faith. The present is not a copying of the past, still less ought it to be a sentimentalising of the past. It is rather a new creation in which an understanding of the past must play a large part. In this past the Articles of Religion should be allowed their right and proper influence.

## 7

Hoskyns' final sermon in the course was on the weakness of the Articles and we shall not be departing from our theme to follow him there also. He said :

The effect of the central Articles is to bring us back to the N.T.—*and to leave us there*. Only on a few points, which are stated in the last three Articles, do they give us any guidance as to what should result from Salvation by Christ, or as to the kind of activity which may be expected of Englishmen who are controlled by belief in Jesus according to the Scriptures and according to the Articles. . . .

Now it is just where the Articles leave us or where they lack conviction that we most need guidance. . . . We are men of the world, firmly rooted in it. It is not merely that we may have to fight in a war or that we may be brought into a law court. We must needs do our work in this world. It is the relation between Christian Salvation and the normal run and vocation of a man's life which constitutes the permanent tension. And the Church ought to give us guidance here. The trouble with the Articles is that they are so anxious, and rightly anxious, to bring us under the control of the N.T. that they may lead us back to the N.T. times and leave us enmeshed in a piety which was inevitable in N.T. times when the Christians were not responsible for the management of human affairs, but needs immense application when Christian men inevitably have great responsibilities upon their shoulders. The danger of the Articles is Pietism.

Now, when once we endeavour to set out the problem of the relation between Christian Salvation and Civilization, two great dangers arise, which belong not to our thought, but to actual past history.

The first is that the Christian Religion goes pacifist in a general sense, and withdraws men and women from the vigour of life,



so that conversion—I am not frightened of the word—takes the edge off their work, and they become aloof, less critical, more sentimental, pietistic, with a tendency to form themselves into sects, without recognising that they share responsibility for the health of this Realm as a whole. This is the danger of Protestantism where it is not saved from itself by a formal connexion with the State, that is by an establishment. But we Christians need a greater protection from mere Pietism than is provided by the Establishment. For the Establishment alone will not preserve us from a general pacificism. It is, I suppose, the Pietism of the Articles, which has caused them to be so roughly handled by the critics of Protestantism.

There is, however, an even greater danger than Sectarian Pietism within the Church. The greater danger is lest the Church, confident that it possesses the Truth, should seek to extend its dogmatic authority outside the strict and limited field of Salvation, and develop an all embracing orthodoxy. The danger is lest the Church produce an authoritative Christian Philosophy, an authoritative political theory, a Christian foreign policy, a Christian view of economics, and, what is much worse, a Christian ethical system by which each detailed action is guided and controlled; and so we become enmeshed in a system, and the Church, expanding beyond its authoritative sphere, kills us. We die when Bishops pronounce upon a coal strike, or upon the wages of agricultural labourers, or upon the findings of a Naval Conference or give authoritative directions concerning birth control.

Thanks be to God there is an escape from the dilemma, and thanks also be to Him for His power in revealing to His children a freedom both from Pietism and from the deadly power of an all embracing ecclesiastical tyranny. By the grace of God the heart of the Church of England is sound; but many attempt to pervert us, and for our protection we need a formula, an article to guide us.

Let us presume to write an Article and to number it Article XL, with the heading:

“Concerning the relation between the Church and the World.”

Here then is an attempt:

“The Church exists only to bear witness to Christ and to Him crucified and risen for our Salvation. It effectively declares the

power of God through faith in Christ to be active, energetic and miraculous.

"The Church possesses no infallible human knowledge, whether in politics or science or ethics; it has no authoritative programme of human action and no authoritative system of Philosophy, and yet in spite of this absence of infallibility the Church solemnly condemns any human activity which is not grounded in surrender to God and rooted in faith in Christ. All true civilization is born from the womb of the Church, and nurtured by her maternal care. Consequently, as the Church is permitted no tyranny over man, so also the Church is forbidden to withdraw men from the world in order that they may wallow in their piety and enjoy their precarious salvation. The Church thrusts its sons, cruelly, as it may seem, and without any trace of sentiment, into the world, that they, by the grace of God working in them, may be the means of its salvation, that *in an honest and good heart, having heard the Word, hold it fast, may bring forth fruit—with patience.*"

# ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN RELATIONS

W. TEMPLETON MOORE

WE HAVE been asked by the Joint Report to give "careful study and examination" to the problems of reunion as they concern the National Churches of England and Scotland, and, beyond the two established Churches, the great Anglican and Presbyterian communions in all parts of the world. As one who was educated in Presbyterian theology but has become an Anglican, the present writer has two pairs of spectacles—his present Anglican pair and his discarded Presbyterian pair. When he reads Anglican polemic on questions of reunion, and especially polemic on Episcopal-Presbyterian relations, he has a tendency to resume his discarded spectacles and so to read the polemic as it would appear to a Presbyterian theologian. Our journalistic polemic, in particular, when seen in this way, is usually completely inept. Sometimes even the more careful scholarship in the less journalistic publications seems very wide of the mark—it is knocking down clay pigeons but completely missing the real target. Often, indeed, the ecumenical discussions of Anglicanism seem to sell the pass to Presbyterianism—when writing against the Roman position Anglicans fall into positions which make one wonder where they differ from Scottish Presbyterianism, and when writing against English nonconformity they fall into positions which strengthen the Presbyterian case. It would be easy to pick out a concatenation of carefully thought-out *dicta* from High Anglican scholars which, if printed in one sequence, would suggest that nothing divides the theology of the Established Churches of England and Scotland, and that intercommunion should be an accepted fact. All this seems due to an ignorance or ignoring of the Presbyterian position—we hit at Rome and unconsciously side with Geneva, we hit at nonconformity and unconsciously support the Scottish establishment.

If study is to be given to the real issue between Episcopal and Presbyterian ecclesiology, then it would be well to see what the real issues *are* and to formulate carefully the Anglican position with

regard to them. The present article is intended simply to indicate what some of the real issues are and to clear away certain misunderstandings, not to suggest how the Anglican position should be clarified to meet the needs of fruitful Episcopal-Presbyterian discussion.

First, it may be suggested that Presbyterians are not so much in the dark about the real issues as many Anglicans are. The writer, as an ordinary student for the Presbyterian ministry, was subjected to a two year course in Symbolics. In this more attention was devoted to the Tridentine Decrees and the XXXIX Articles than to the Westminster Confession—Roman theology and Anglican theology were important subjects of study. Again, the writer remembers being assigned an essay in Church History on the theme "Compare and contrast the constitution of the Presbyterian Church with (a) The Apostolic Church; (b) The Church in the Second Century; and (c) The Church in the Third Century". Three months were allowed for preparing the essay and recommended books were nearly all by *Anglican* scholars, and many of them by "High" Anglicans. The ordinary Presbyterian minister who has gone through such training will, one feels, know something of other theological positions than that of his own tradition. Can we so readily assume that the average clerical reader of an Anglican Church newspaper will know the Presbyterian position when it is under discussion?

Second, and not unconnected with the former point, Scottish theology since the Reformation has at all times been forced to have a more ecumenical outlook than Anglican. Until modern times Anglicanism was confined to English-speaking people and mostly to English people or to lesser breeds subject to English rule. The Scots, on the other hand, were saved from insularity by their close contacts with the Continental Reformed Churches. To this day it is customary to send divinity students to continental universities, and continental students come to Presbyterian faculties in the United Kingdom. In my college we had a connection with the Hungarian Reformed Church, which is greater numerically than Scottish Presbyterianism, so that we always had one or more Hungarian students among us. The best students among us were always offered the opportunity of a year at the University of Bonn, where Karl Barth then occupied a chair, and those who did not qualify for this could always obtain a year at Strasburg University. This coming

and going has meant that the Church of Scotland has always regarded itself in the light of the sisterhood of churches to which it belonged, while the Church of England has been insulated, cut off from Rome on the one side and from the Lutheran and Reformed Churches on the other, with only purely English schisms as a standard of comparison. Even within Great Britain, the Scot has tended to come south to an English university much more than the Englishman has gone north to a Scottish university. While English *scholarship* has never been insular, Anglican *theology* has tended in that direction, but Scottish theology has always had a wide continental background. On the continent the Reformed have always found themselves cheek-by-jowl with Romanism and Lutheranism. Their position has always been worked out over against great and important bodies, with great and important thinkers and scholars. By its affiliations the Scottish Church has also seen itself in that situation. The English Church has, through the centuries, had no affiliations abroad. At home it had only small non-conformist bodies over against itself, apart from the distant shadow of Rome. So the Anglican position has established itself in a rather self-centred way. For instance, Anglicanism emphasizes the autonomy of a National Church as against the presumptions of the See of Rome, but neglects to emphasize the autonomy of the National Church in Scotland. Again, Anglicanism emphasizes the continuity of the National Church as against nonconformity, but neglects to emphasize the continuity of the National Church in Scotland. If it is *assumed* that the English Church has used its autonomy, while the Scottish Church has abused its autonomy, or that the English Church has kept its continuity while the Scottish Church has not kept its continuity, the obvious retort is, "Prove what you are assuming, if you can"—and no proof is forthcoming. Here are questions which need deciding—what exactly is the Anglican doctrine of the autonomy and continuity of a National Church, and is it such that it applies only to the Church of England and not to the Church of Scotland?

All this leads us to a third point. The usual answer to the questions raised above is to say that the English Church remained catholic when it was reformed, but the Scottish Church did not. However, the Scottish theologian may easily look on this as another unbased assumption. The word "catholic" often seems to be treated after the manner of Humpty Dumpty—"It means just



what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less". For the Roman the word means what is Roman; for some Anglicans the word also means, practically, what is Roman; for other Anglicans the word includes what is Roman and what is Anglican; for still other Anglicans the word excludes much that is Roman and is, to all intents and purposes, equivalent to Anglican. Yet we possess an ancient and widely accepted definition of the word—*semper, et ubique, et ab omnibus*. Scottish scholars, with much learning, have set out to show that, by this definition, their Church is just as catholic as the Church of England—perhaps more so. This position is not answered by assuming a definition of the word which will include what is Anglican but exclude what is Scottish. There are points where Scotland agrees with Rome against England and at least one point where Scotland agrees with the Eastern Church against Rome and England. Scottish scholars have powerful backing from St Jerome and St Thomas Aquinas on some of their points. They also feel that much of their system is firmly based on the doctrine and practice of St Cyprian. As well as these scholarly points, the Scottish Church feels that its long and successful battle to preserve the Church from civil interference is much more "catholic" than the meek acceptance of State control in the Church of England. Is the term "catholic" an absolute or a relative term? Is it ever possible to say, "We are catholic as a Church and you are not," or is the true statement, "On this point we are more catholic than you are, but on that point you are more catholic than we are"? The Scottish scholar would be quite prepared to admit the *greater* catholicity of the English Church in certain respects but not in others, though he might refuse to admit a claim to catholicity in an absolute sense. The question then arises, "Which points are *more essential* to general catholicity and which less?" Here again, it will not satisfy the Scot to assert, "The points which Anglicanism has maintained are more essential, while the points which you have retained are less essential"—he will require scholarly *demonstration* rather than an *assumption*.

A fourth point has already emerged in the reference above to Scottish resistance to civil interference in Church affairs. Anglicans often seem to be ignorant of Scottish ecclesiastical history and of Scottish legal and constitutional history. While differences exist in Scotland as in England, it is probably true to say that Scottish scholars nowadays would be more ready to abandon John Knox

than to abandon St Columba. The Scottish Church was later even than the Irish Church in abandoning Celtic organization and conforming to general Western and Roman practice—it was not till the end of the eleventh century that the process was begun. Out of fourteen centuries of its history, the Scottish Church was in some conformity with the general body of Western Christendom for a bare four centuries. History is more alive to the Celt than to the Englishman, and the long and glorious history of the Celtic Church is a far greater part of the Scottish heritage than it has ever been of the English. Does modern Anglicanism still stand by the position of the Council of Chelsea in 816 with regard to the validity of Celtic orders? It is easy nowadays to say, "The Columban Church may have been very irregular, but, of course, they did have bishops and an episcopal succession, so they were quite all right". If the ordination of St Aidan, as recorded by Bede, were to take place to-day, would its validity be accepted by Anglicans? If St Chad had to be reconsecrated to meet the demands of Western ideas of validity, what guarantee have we that *any* consecration or ordination was valid in the Celtic Church? It is not only in modern times that the Scottish Church has had the validity of her orders challenged—they have been challenged through nearly three-quarters of her long history. Yet she sees the *canonization* of some of her greatest sons universally accepted, while the validity of their orders may be questioned. She may feel proud to be unchurched with her greatest saints. It was a great Anglican Bishop and scholar who declared, "Not Augustine, the great Roman missionary . . . but Aidan was the true Apostle of England", yet Aidan might not be accepted by the Church of England to-day, and some Anglican pronouncements suggest that he would not be accepted.

Though the position of the Celtic Church may be important to the Scot, it seems remote to the Englishman. The history of the Scottish Church at and since the Reformation is, however, tied to her history when she was in full communion with Western Christendom, and this historic connection sets her apart from what is generally understood by the English. Until 1472 Metropolitan authority was held in Scotland not by archbishops, as in England, but by the Provincial Council. At the time of the Reformation, archbishops had existed in Scotland for less than a century, but even during that time the Provincial Council had not lost its metropolitan powers—powers much greater than those of the

English Convocations. In the English constitution there has never been anything like the Scottish Provincial Council. When Scotland broke from allegiance to the See of Rome and ceased to be a "province", this Council was re-named "the General Assembly". It had its position in the constitution of Scotland and has retained that position till this day. When Andrew Melville said to James VI and I, "As many times before, so once again I would remind your Majesty that within this Realm of Scotland there are two kings and two kingdoms—the State, of which King James is the head, and the Kirk, of which King James is neither King nor Head, but a subject", he was not stating a *Presbyterian* position but a *constitutional* one. A National Church, subject to Crown and Parliament, has no place in Scottish constitutional history—instead there is a National Church *parallel* to Crown and Parliament. This constitutional feature is continued and assured by the Act of Union, with other parts of Scottish law. The totally different bases of Establishment in Scotland and in England is in no way bound up with any difference between Presbyterianism and Anglicanism but with ancient constitutional history. Anglican understanding on this matter is important, since the rejection of Episcopacy in 1690 was not merely a theological but a constitutional issue, and the previous episcopate introduced in 1610 quite constitutionally might have endured had it not become associated with the other wildly unconstitutional measures of Charles I.

A fifth point of importance is that the Scottish Church since the Reformation has never been Anglican, even when it was episcopal, *and has never at any time been anything which present day Anglicanism could accept*. The present Episcopal Church in Scotland is now definitely Anglican, and it naturally claims to represent the "Catholic" Church in Scotland, but when its origins are considered this claim can be a great embarrassment to present day Anglicanism. Before we consider the experiment from which the present Episcopal Church took its rise, let us glance at the previous post-Reformation experiments with bishops. At the Reformation two bishops were kept on in their dioceses with the new title of "Superintendent", which may have been intended to translate the Greek *episcopos*. In 1572 an Archbishop of St Andrews was consecrated, but only one duly consecrated bishop was among the consecrators. In 1610 it was decided to superimpose bishops on the existing Presbyterian system. Three of the titular bishops proceeded

to England for episcopal consecration, which they then transmitted to their colleagues. Their Presbyterian ordination was not questioned—they were consecrated without any question of first ordaining them to the priesthood. The clergy were not re-ordained, the Genevan liturgy continued, and the bishops ordained in conjunction with presbyteries whose members had not received episcopal ordination. All this was done perfectly constitutionally, and the bishops-elect themselves insisted on the approval of the General Assembly, to which they remained subject. This arrangement might well have endured had it not been for the disastrous Royal attempts to Anglicanize the Scottish Church. Constitutional forms were abandoned by Charles I, and the culmination of the disaster was the King's efforts to impose the Laudian liturgy by royal authority. Much misunderstanding was involved in this episode—Laud claimed that he had been misled by the Scottish bishops. Laud has been blamed for preparing for Scotland a prayer-book more "catholic" than the current English book, but it is fair to point out that every point on which Laud's book differs from the English book would have made it *more* and not less acceptable to Scottish tradition. Some of the drafts prepared by Scottish bishops have been preserved and published—they do not depart from the liturgical pattern, derived from Strasburg, which had till then been observed in Scotland. It was the *Englishness* of Laud's book and the highly unconstitutional procedure which led to the catastrophe. The bishops had done their best, but they were associated with the attempt in the public mind, and so the General Assembly deposed them. The present Episcopal Church took its rise from the completely unconstitutional effort of Charles II at his Restoration. This time the bishops-elect were ordained to the priesthood before being consecrated, which was greatly resented by most of them, but, as before, the clergy of Scotland were not re-ordained. While before the Church had had its liturgy, that had been abolished during the Commonwealth period, as part of the projected union of the three National Churches, in favour of the Westminster Directory. During the twenty-eight years of Episcopacy no attempt was made to revive the old liturgy, to re-introduce Laud's book, or to provide any Prayer Book. Instead rambling extemporary prayers held the field. Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods continued, though the General Assembly was forbidden to meet. It was from this state of affairs that the Episcopal Church took its origin when, at the



Revolution, constitutional forms were restored and the General Assembly again deposed the bishops. The Episcopal clergy who then left the Establishment left as non-jurors, for all who were prepared to take the oath of loyalty to William III were retained or readmitted. Meantime the Church of England was becoming staunchly Hanoverian, and the Jacobite Scottish Episcopalians were not popular with Anglicans. The eighteenth century was well advanced before the Episcopal Church abandoned extemporary prayer and Kirk Sessions and began to Anglicanize itself. It does not seem likely that the Restoration precedent would find favour with modern Anglicans, as a means of restoring the "Historic Episcopate" to the Church of Scotland, nor would the precedent of 1610 be accepted now.

Lastly, a number of points in connection with the Historic Episcopate and its transmission need to be cleared up from an Anglican point of view. The Church of Rome could allow Duchesne to get away with an almost Presbyterian statement about the episcopate in Rome itself before A.D. 160, because she is not committed to any stage of *undeveloped* doctrine or practice, while Anglicanism seems compelled to contest such points. The Presbyterian theory of a collegiate episcopacy gets over the difficulties of transmission in the sub-Apostolic age as no alternative theory does. Very early we have an insistence on the succession of bishops in certain of the great cities. This was, however, a succession in *office* and not in transmission. A bishop cannot well have consecrated his successor in office, since he would have been dead before a successor could be appointed. In those days when Christian communities were far apart, was there a long break until three bishops could be persuaded to travel from distant cities to consecrate a successor when a bishop died? Had a minimum of three monarchical bishops already in those days become a *sine qua non* of valid consecration. When we consider all the difficulties which the modern method of transmission must have faced in sub-Apostolic times, the theory of collegiate episcopate gives a much greater guarantee of unbroken succession. There is also a great deal of *prima facie* evidence that this was the method of transmission and that it persisted at Rome into the second century and at Alexandria even later. Anglicans seem compelled to contest this evidence, not, one feels, with any great success. A doctrine of development overcomes this difficulty—the evidence can then be welcomed, as



guaranteeing the succession, but the developed stage of monarchical episcopacy is regarded as the full-grown tree, and collegiate episcopacy as a temporary stage through which the tree had to pass on its way to fullness of growth. Though we use the word "Presbyterian" for the Scottish and Continental Reformed doctrine of the ministry, the word is misleading. "Conciliar" or "Collegiate" would be a better word, and it has often been pointed out that the Presbyterian system in practice is very much that contemplated by St Cyprian. The "identity" of bishop and presbyter claimed by Presbyterians has never been claimed as an absolute identity—it is not the individual presbyter who has the right to execute episcopal functions but the council or college of presbyters. The episcopate has been regarded as a *function* of the Presbytery, not as a possession of the individual presbyter. Presbyterians may make the claim that their system is "catholic", holding that it was *once* the practice of the Catholic Church, but they probably would no longer try to claim it as primitive, since their practice does not coincide with what in theory they claim for the Apostolic Church, but rather with what obtained in the second and early third centuries. If *some* development has to be admitted on the primitive, why not *full* development? On some such lines the best Presbyterian scholars might well be prepared to receive back the Historic Episcopate. Does, however, Anglican theology really admit of a doctrine of development? The doctrine of St Jerome, followed by St Thomas Aquinas, differs from official Anglican teaching. St Jerome held that the episcopate is not a separate *order* of the ministry, so that a bishop is not ordained in a grace-conferring sacrament, but *consecrated* to a high and indispensable office. As contrasted with this, Anglicanism speaks of three *orders* of the ministry. Presbyterians could more readily receive the doctrine of St Jerome than that of Anglicanism. It can hardly be denied that a doctrine with the powerful support of St Jerome and St Thomas Aquinas is "catholic"—in some sense. Are Anglicans prepared to re-examine their position in the light of that doctrine? In what sense are we committed to the doctrine that there are three separate and distinct *orders* of the ministry? Are we compelled to hold that this arrangement was primitive?

The writer has crossed the bridge from Presbyterianism to Anglicanism without feeling that he has had to forsake intellectual integrity or forsake any position which he was convinced was

sound. It may be long before the masses of the Scottish people are ready to receive episcopacy in their National Church, but meantime there is no reason why the breach between Anglican and Presbyterian scholarship could not be progressively narrowed. It is in the realm of *scholarship* that the work must begin, rather than in the realm of doctrine. An agreed doctrinal statement can only follow preliminary agreement, closer than at present, along some of the lines we have tried to indicate. The Scottish layman is more interested in sound scholarship than his opposite number in England, and the Scottish clergy as a body are, perhaps, more interested in sound scholarship than the majority of the English clergy. Scholarship first and doctrine afterwards, or doctrine based on scholarship—that has been the Scottish tradition. It is along such lines that the two National Churches of this island may at last be brought into communion.

# DR MASCALL AND THE ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN REPORT

H. E. W. TURNER

IT IS always a pleasure to read what Dr Mascall writes on Systematic Theology. His work, though sometimes provocative, is always characterized by lucidity and penetration. At the same time as a participant in the Conversations which led to the Report which he reviewed in the January number of the Church Quarterly Review, I think that there are certain comments which it may be timely to make. I speak, of course, only for myself.

As Dr Mascall is careful to note, the Report does not claim to offer more than an explanatory survey of some parts of the field, though he complains that the wrong portions were chosen for this purpose. We urged ample time for consideration on all sides, and I, for one, would not feel that our work had been unproductive if the participating Churches were to resume discussions on precisely the kind of question which Dr Mascall is raising. Such matters are just as likely to be in Presbyterian as in Anglican minds.

The chief criticism raised in Dr Mascall's article is that the Report does not seem to face radically enough the theological questions of episcopacy and priesthood. So indeed it must appear from his standpoint, but I am tempted to wonder whether those who think with him are not trying to impose upon the Church of England as a whole a theology of the Christian Ministry which, while certainly permissible thinking, does not by any means represent her mind as a whole, and is not explicitly contained in her Formularies. Certainly those who maintain this position have the right to ask that nothing be done in practice to make their position within the Church untenable, but, for example, his particular phrasing of the relation between Order and Jurisdiction, and at least some of the inferences which he draws elsewhere from the concept of "character" are matters upon which it would be idle to pretend that the Church of England spoke with a single voice.

The approach adopted to the question of the Ministry throughout

the Conversations lay through its functions. To discuss the various theories of episcopacy (*esse, bene esse, plene esse*) would really have carried us no further, particularly as it might have been difficult to devise a formula of this type which would commend itself to all the participants even on the Anglican side. A more promising and fruitful beginning appeared to lie in an examination of the root idea of *episkopé*, its relation to the Church as a whole and to its several orders. Clear Anglican precedent for this approach is to be found in the Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England*. To approach the theology of episcopacy in isolation would have proved (in all probability) a *cul de sac*; to consider what a bishop does and how he is regarded opens up new possibilities of mutual understanding. Part at least of the problem is that in the minds of many the episcopate is associated with what Richard Baxter called "prelacy and the diocesan frame". The name popularly given to the Report in some quarters "the Bishops' Report" is not only a damnatory label; it seriously misconceives what we were trying to do.

Dr Mascall similarly finds the Report lacking in any serious discussion of the idea of priesthood. He would put many of us greatly in his debt if he would give us a succinct definition of the term from his point of view, particularly if it were accompanied with a close comparison with the classical Anglican formularies. Once again we were concerned rather with functions than with a particular theology of this order of Ministry. Where these are broadly the same, is the use of terms a matter of first importance?

Dr Mascall, then, considers that in our Report we put the cart before the horse. This would indeed have been the case if we had been driving his cart, but in fact we weren't. It is fair comment that from his point of view there were prior questions which ought to have been handled first. As he suggests, the Churches engaged may yet invite each other to resume their work. But even if they prove to be a theological *casus reservatus*, they will probably be tackled all the better in the light of agreements already reached.

There is perhaps some danger of misinterpretation in the quotation of two sentences of the Report on page 8 of Dr Mascall's article. In the Report itself they are slightly indented and lettered (a) and (b). They represented governing principles which provide the context in which our discussion of the specific Ministry of the Church was to be understood. The further exploration of the meaning of the

priesthood of Christ on the following page indicates that the point which Dr Mascall is making was not completely missed: “. . . it shares in his priestly ministry in that it is consecrated to be a holy people, offering itself as a living sacrifice to God through Christ, and it is entrusted with the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments and of intercession in lifting up the world to God”. I hardly think that any of us were inclined to forget the Godward side either of the life of the Church as a whole or of the ordained Ministry in particular. The concept of a ministerial priesthood, certainly exercised before God, but within and towards the Church, and through her to the world at large, is at least a thoroughly permissible Anglican starting point and might well represent the intention of the Report.

It is certainly possible that the Report may give the impression that we were primarily concerned to suggest a process of mutual adaptation. This would, however, be a half-truth, and the less important half of the truth. We believed that the theological part of our task was in fact the more important and that the proposed modifications arose naturally within this context. Although the phrase does not occur (perhaps rightly) within the Report, I have come increasingly to view our work in the light of the principle of “fullness through wholeness”, the belief that our two traditions will never attain to the fullness of stature which is theirs in Christ without a restoration of the proper organic relationship of all parts of the Church (the laity included) to each other.

The measure of difference between Dr Mascall's approach and our own is clearly illustrated by his reference to the analogy of the old Irish Church. At certain stages I had wondered myself whether it would serve our need. In effect we seemed to be moving in a different direction. The point that Anglicans tend to demand less in the realm of order and more in the realm of jurisdiction than they should is interesting, but the reason which Dr Mascall assigns, the confusion between the two spheres, would not come naturally to many Anglicans. Some of us find ourselves rather in agreement with authorities like Bishop Headlam and Oliver Quick in regarding the distinction as providing a fallacious clarity. In general I find it difficult to return a straight “Either-Or” answer to questions of order. This will obviously appear to Dr Mascall surprising, but it is probably the real *principium divisionis* between us on the question of the Ministry. It might also serve to explain why a suggestion of



this kind (particularly if it is geared into this distinction) might not commend itself to all Anglicans. From the Presbyterian side it would probably fail to secure support for a different reason. In their tradition the Anglican dyad of Faith and Order is expanded into a triad, Faith, Order, and Discipline, of which the third term is just as important as the other two. An episcopate restored solely for the purposes of ordination and confirmation is hardly likely to prove acceptable.

It is in the light of this Reformed triad that the suggested modifications in the Anglican polity must be read. Here I suggest that Dr Mascall gravely underestimates the strength of the conviction which underlies them. Indeed I think that the main danger from the Anglican side is to regard them simply as matters of organization. But since they affect the discipline of the Church they appear as much matters affecting the health and fullness of the Church to Presbyterians as the Historic Episcopate to Anglicans. From the Reformed point of view the pans of the balance are not as unequally poised as Anglicans may be tempted to think. That they are not necessarily regarded as conditions for intercommunion on the Presbyterian side, whereas the historic episcopate almost certainly would on the Anglican side, does not materially affect the issue in view of the different theologies of inter-communion held within the two traditions.

Dr Mascall quotes a paragraph from the Report on the subject of intercommunion and finds it obscure. It is probably one of the cases in which a summary of deliberations without the context of discussion may well appear opaque, especially to those whose attitude is so strongly marked and clear cut as Dr Mascall's own. Another Anglican reviewer of a rather different theological school seized the point at once. It was, I believe, the attitude of the late Archbishop Temple that the real difficulty about intercommunion was participation in the Sacrament of Unity while schism reigned unchecked. It seemed right in dealing with this topic to call attention to the emergence of a new situation when Churches had begun to take active steps to move back into full fellowship with each other, and when, as it were, the heart had gone out of the schism, even though it had not yet been completely healed. Here is a situation for which a clear-cut and static theology such as that of Dr Mascall is not best equipped to deal, or even perhaps to appreciate. The Report, however, calls attention to a new context in which (if it arises) the question should be thought out afresh. Here we were not prepared

to rush our fences or to assume prerogatives which belong properly to other Anglican bodies, but to make a suggestion as a possibility which would repay later exploration.

Dr Mascall concludes with some points drawn from his own review of the late Professor Donald Baillie's posthumous volume *The Theology of the Sacraments*. Like Dr Mascall I have been trying for some time to pin-point the root differences between the Catholic and Protestant traditions which seem to me to rest ultimately upon two different types of Christian spirituality. I think that I can see something of what is involved for him in the description of the Church as the extension of the Incarnation. At the same time I cannot share his dismay at the gulf between the Anglican and Reformed traditions which he finds mirrored in the book. If by Anglican in this context Dr Mascall really means Anglo-Catholic, then the statement is just and I would not wish to dispute the point with him. As a matter of fact in my lectures on Christology I always refer instinctively to our Lord's "post-incarnate life". Presbyterians (and here I would agree with them) do not find it natural to carry the implications of the Pauline image of the Body of Christ as far, for example, as Dr Mascall's fine book *Christ, the Christian and the Church* or to the lengths of the virtual "bilateralism" between Christ and the Church expounded in Mersch's *La theologie du corps mystique*, which I bought several years ago on Dr Mascall's own recommendation. No one would wish to deny the deep significance of the Pauline concept, but there is a wide and legitimate margin of disagreement on the limits to which both exegesis and theological deduction can be carried. The divide surely falls within the Anglican tradition itself and is not merely a straight divide between the Anglican and Presbyterian traditions. Many will find a direct link between the static and somewhat scholastic approach to the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments and over-exegesis of this particular concept. Many Anglicans will find in Professor Baillie's book more signs for encouragement than dismay, and some may even find therein a position somewhat similar to their own, which has had a long and honoured history within the Anglican tradition and is at least as consonant with our formularies as Dr Mascall's.

Many will be grateful for the lucidity and positive approach of Dr Mascall's comments. It is all to the good to have the views of those who might be expected to be critical of our Report. At the same time I cannot but feel that the approach of the Report, tenta-

tive and exploratory as it admittedly is, will get us a good deal nearer our objective than the static clarities of Dr Mascall's own system. It must not be forgotten that the whole Ecumenical Movement presents a new and dynamic challenge to our theologies of the Church and the Ministry with which, at least as they have been classically presented, they may prove inadequate to deal. A theology of the trenches may not be able to handle successfully a campaign of movement.

# TITLES OF THE ROMAN SEE

H. BURN-MURDOCH

THE early records, both of Church and State, show how "compliments came to crystallize into formalities, and formalities are by and by claimed and worked into effective usage".<sup>1</sup> The Roman emperors always received florid and high-flown language; some of this attached also to their officers of state. Thus Valentinian III addresses Aëtius, the Patrician and military commander-in-chief, as "Father most dear to the Emperor, . . . your illustrious and conspicuous magnificence . . . may the Divine Hand preserve thee for many years to come, dearest Cousin".<sup>2</sup> Such expressions had become words of style; their sincerity may be judged from the subsequent murder of Aëtius by Valentinian.

In the Church, on the other hand, for at least the first three centuries, churches and their bishops were addressed in very simple terms, and so described themselves. Thus towards the end of the first century, it is simply "the church of God which sojourneth in Rome" that writes a famous letter to "the church of God which sojourneth in Corinth". According to accepted tradition, St Clement was then bishop of Rome, and the letter is always known by his name, but it never refers to him or to any other bishop: it uses the word "bishops" only in the New Testament sense as a description of the presbyters. Yet St James of Jerusalem, who presided there very much like a second-century bishop, was known simply as "James";<sup>3</sup> it seems likely that Clement similarly was bishop of Rome in fact, though not then so styled in Rome. Long before the time of St Irenaeus, himself bishop of Lyons, the bishops of Rome were called "bishop"; in his great treatise on the faith, written circa A.D. 185, he includes in his list of bishops the early names of Linus, Anencletus and Clement, ending with "Eleutherus, the twelfth from the apostles". The church itself is for him simply "the church in Rome".<sup>4</sup>

The third-century records do not show any elaboration of ecclesiastical styles. Letters passing between St Cyprian, pope of



Carthage, and the bishops of Rome, begin very simply, *Cyprianus Cornelio fratri salutem, Stephano fratri salutem, Cornelius Cypriano fratri salutem*. (A primate of Alexandria or Carthage was called "pope", and Cyprian was so addressed by the clergy of Rome.<sup>5</sup> This Eastern title was used also for the bishops of some other sees, but never for the Roman bishops before the fourth century; it was not claimed for them exclusively until the eleventh century.)<sup>6</sup>

Eusebius, the Church historian, *circa* A.D. 324, always speaks of "the church of the Romans".<sup>7</sup> Alexander is "bishop of the Romans", Clement was "at the head of the church of the Romans", and Victor "the president of the church of the Romans".<sup>8</sup> The Council of Sardica in A.D. 343 speaks of "the Roman bishop" and "the Roman church".<sup>9</sup>

"An apostolic see" is a description that grew into a formal title. It described each of "the apostolical churches in which the very seats of the apostles at this very day do preside in their own places", said Tertullian, early in the third century: he instanced Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, and Rome.<sup>10</sup> Pope St Siricius (A.D. 384-98) describes as an apostolic see the principal or metropolitan see of any province.<sup>11</sup> St Augustine more than once speaks of "apostolic sees" in the plural,<sup>12</sup> and so does Pope Pelagius I (A.D. 555-60).<sup>13</sup> But Rome was the only apostolic see in the West and, as St Irenaeus said, it claimed not one but "two very glorious apostles". Latin has no definite or indefinite article, so one cannot be sure when the phrase as applied to Rome took the sense of *the* apostolic see; but it did so in the course of time, and *sedes apostolica* became a Roman title, as it now is.

Another phrase that has been appropriated to Rome is "Vicar of Christ". In the early centuries it was used of the Holy Ghost.<sup>14</sup> But any priest can, in a general way, be thought of as a vicar of him in whose Name he pronounces absolution.<sup>15</sup> "Vicars of Christ" came to be an epithet for all bishops, and it was so used, for example, by Pope Hormisdas,<sup>16</sup> and by the Councils of Compiègne and Meaux in the ninth century.<sup>17</sup> Pope Innocent III († 1216) was, perhaps, the first to claim the phrase as his individual title, and in A.D. 1302 Pope Boniface VIII in *Unam Sanctam* declared that "Christ and His Vicar constitute only one Head",<sup>18</sup> (which echoes, no doubt unintentionally, St John 10. 30, "I and the Father are one").

"Supreme Pontiff" is a title with a curious history. *Pontifex maximus* was a title of the pagan Roman emperors, and by it were

addressed such monsters of vice and tyranny as Caligula and Commodus. So Tertullian, early in the third century, after he had become a Montanist, in attacking some bishop unnamed (probably the bishop of Rome),<sup>19</sup> dubbed him "*pontifex maximus*" in biting sarcasm.<sup>20</sup> The Christian emperors of Rome continued for half a century to use the pagan title, until Gratian dropped it.<sup>21</sup> But *pontifex* came into latin use as equivalent to *sacerdos*, and by about A.D. 1000 *summus pontifex* was a general style of archbishops in the West.<sup>22</sup> It was gradually restricted to Rome, and it had become a favourite papal title by the time of Pope Paul II (1464-71).

"Head of the Church" has now become well established as a papal title. In the Church of the Fathers, this was unheard of. In all the teaching of St Augustine, for example, no head of the Church is heard of other than Christ himself; he describes the bishop of Rome as "president of the Church in the West".<sup>23</sup>

Returning to the usage of the early centuries, we find that in the fourth century, and well on into the fifth, the church of Rome and its bishop were still described in the usual old way. Constantine writes (A.D. 314) "to Miltiades, bishop of the city of Rome",<sup>24</sup> the Council of Sardica writes to "Julius, bishop of the city of Rome"<sup>25</sup> the emperors write to "Damasus, bishop of the city of Rome".<sup>26</sup> In A.D. 382 the council "in the great city of Constantinople" write to the Roman bishop and council as "the very dear and most religious brothers and fellow-ministers Damasus, Ambrosius, Brittonius etc., and the other holy bishops met together in the great city of Rome".<sup>27</sup> St John Chrysostom writes "to Innocent, bishop of the Roman city";<sup>28</sup> "Boniface, bishop of the city of Rome" writes to Hilary, bishop of Narbonne,<sup>29</sup> and he was addressed by the Emperor Honorius as "holy and venerable pope of the eternal city".<sup>30</sup> As late as the middle of the fifth century, St Leo I frequently in his letters called himself "bishop of Rome" or "bishop of the city of Rome".<sup>31</sup>

Schismatical and heretical communities abounded. As early as the time of St Polycarp's martyrdom (A.D. 156) there were Basilideans, Marcionites, Valentinians, and others.<sup>32</sup> Afterwards the Novatians had churches everywhere, and they were flourishing at Constantinople when in A.D. 385 their bishop died after a forty-year episcopate.<sup>33</sup> The word "catholic", which at first meant simply "world-wide", "universal", as contrasted with any local church, came to connote the ideas of sound orthodoxy and apostolic order,

as contrasted with an heretical or schismatic community,<sup>34</sup> and orthodox churches and their bishops came to be distinguished as "catholic" in this sense of the word. So Pope Liberius (A.D. 352-66) writes to certain named bishops "and to all the orthodox bishops of the East",<sup>35</sup> and "to the catholic bishops of Italy".<sup>36</sup> Pope Damasus writes from a Roman council in A.D. 372 to "the catholic bishops of the East".<sup>37</sup> Pope St Leo I writes "to the catholic Egyptian bishops sojourning in Constantinople", and also "to Timothy, catholic bishop of the church of Alexandria".<sup>38</sup>

But schismatics and heretics were established at Rome as elsewhere. Pope Damasus had to endure these, as well as the long schism of the rival pope Ursinus. Mgr Duchesne says<sup>39</sup> "Rome was full of 'little Churches'. Not to speak of such remnants as there might be of old sects, such as Valentinians, Marcionites, Montanists, and Sabellians, the Novatian Church still continued to exist, governed by a series of bishops, who linked themselves on to the old episcopal succession from St Peter to Fabian . . . the Donatists were organized separately, under bishops of their own country . . . There were also the Luciferians so-called . . . they had a bishop who was named Aurelius". Damasus, however, obtained effective support from the emperors Valentinian I and his son Gratian, and he made some headway against the schismatics by "continual appeal to the secular arm".<sup>40</sup>

The Novatians persisted in Rome. The fifth-century historian, Socrates, says<sup>41</sup> that Innocent I (pope A.D. 402-17) "took away the churches from the Novatians in Rome also, and obliged Rusticula their bishop to hold his meetings secretly in private houses. Until this time the Novatians had flourished exceedingly in Rome", with many churches and large congregations.<sup>42</sup> When St Leo the Great died in A.D. 461, "The dissident heretics who, in one degree or another had troubled the unity of the Roman Church for two centuries, were gone. Donatists, Novatians, Manichees, and their Bishops of Rome with them".<sup>43</sup> But one harassing exception remained; even in the reign of Leo, "the Barbarians who were now Rome's real rulers were Arians, and the popes had perforce to submit to the facts of Arian churches and an Arian bishop."<sup>44</sup> Ricimer, while master of Rome from 456 to 472, supported an Arian bishop and built for him there St Agata dei Goti in the heart of the city. It was not until the middle of the sixth century that the Arian clergy were driven from Rome.<sup>45</sup>

The distinctive title "catholic church of the city" came into use by the beginning of the fifth century. In A.D. 418, after the death of Pope Zosimus, rival candidates had been elected and consecrated to the papal chair, as often occurred. Some of the priests in Rome wrote to "the most pious and clement emperors, Honorius and Theodosius . . . we beseech your clemency . . . after the departure of holy Zosimus, pope of the catholic church of the city of Rome . . ." Both Boniface and Eulalius had been ordained. They entreat the emperors to uphold Boniface.<sup>46</sup> A Roman notary at the Council of Ephesus in A.D. 431 designs himself as "Siricius, notary of the holy catholic church of the city of Rome".<sup>47</sup> St Leo I writes to Theodosius as "Leo, pope of the catholic church of the city of Rome".<sup>48</sup> Pope Hilary, presiding at a Roman council in A.D. 465 is "Hilary, bishop of the holy catholic church of the city of Rome".<sup>49</sup> Pope Vigilius in A.D. 553 was "bishop of the holy catholic church of the city of Rome", and he formally so subscribed his *Constitutum*.<sup>50</sup> By the end of the sixth century, the usual style seems to have become "bishop of the holy catholic and apostolic church of the city of Rome".

Father Hughes observes of the popes of that period that "to distinguish themselves from the heretical titular they signed themselves 'Bishop of the Catholic Church of Rome', or 'Bishop of the Catholic Church', a style which has survived to this day as the consecrated formula for certain official acts."<sup>51</sup>

In those times, "catholic", in the sense of doctrinal orthodoxy, meant holding to the faith of Nicaea and Chalcedon, and freedom from Arian and other heresies. Its application to the doctrine of the sovereignty of the Roman pope is comparatively modern. Long before the final separation of the Latin and Greek Churches in the eleventh century, the East had been again and again out of communion with the Roman see for considerable tracts of time, amounting in all to a large proportion of time.<sup>52</sup> Certainly the Churches in the East never imagined that at such times they were "outside the Catholic Church", nor does Rome seem to have suggested it. Since A.D. 1302, however, the Bull *Unam Sanctam*—"It is altogether necessary for salvation for every creature that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff"—implies, at all events, that those who do not accept the Roman obedience are outside the Church, the Universal and Catholic Church. So in the Roman view, "catholic" is now given an additional and third meaning, of subjection to Rome.



Yet the simple old form, the "holy Roman church", has persisted into modern times, and has been an official and liturgical title since the Council of Trent: it is used in the *Codex Juris Canonici*, 1919. Pope Pius IX at the Vatican Council of 1870 lengthened it to "the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church";<sup>53</sup> none of these four adjectives is recognized as pertaining to any other Christian Church. The title is often abbreviated to "the Roman Church", as in the Index of Prohibited Books, or "the Holy Roman Catholic Church", as by Pope Pius IX.<sup>54</sup> The word "Roman" is alone distinctive. The Constitution of Malta provided by its first article that "the religion of Malta is the Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion". So in 1929, when the Maltese premier, himself a Roman Catholic, had proposed to omit the word "Roman", the Vatican strongly objected: it "could only offend and disgust the Catholics, for whom the word "Roman" was precisely the expression which distinguishes the Catholic religion from all other Christian confessions".<sup>55</sup> In England, however, even before the days of Lollardy and dissent, the adjective "Roman" was not much in favour. The vices of the Roman court were notorious,<sup>56</sup> the greed and exactions of the Roman Curia were resented. Foreigners were thrust into English sees and the richest benefices; the English parliament dared to say that the pope "shears his flock but does not feed it".<sup>57</sup> After the Reformation, the threats of subjection to Spain, the wholesale burnings alive, and all the doings of the Holy Inquisition, added to the unpopularity in England of everything "Roman". At the Vatican Council, the Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith, as first proposed, began, "The Holy Roman Catholic Church believes and confesses", and it was an English bishop, Ullathorne of Birmingham, who strongly objected and at whose instance it was amended to "the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church".<sup>58</sup>

Nowadays care is taken to counter any idea that the Roman Church is Italian, or foreign. It is referred to simply as "Catholic", and the word "Roman" is preferably dropped: this also conveniently asserts that there is nothing Catholic outside that Catholic Church, in the sense of the Roman Obedience, not of the Creed. There are many people in England, commonly among those most hostile to all things Roman, who unthinkingly follow this Roman use of the word "Catholic", thus identifying the Church and doctrine that they reject with the Catholic Church of the Creed that they believe.

- 1 E. Bishop, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1911, Vol. xii, p. 408.
- 2 Baronius, *Annales*, vol. VI, pp. 31-2: Migne P. L., liv, 636.
- 3 Acts 21. 18, etc.
- 4 *Haeres.* III. iii. 2.
- 5 Cypr. *Epp.* xxx, viii. 8, xxiii, xxxi, xxxvi.
- 6 F. X. Funk, *Manual of Church Hist.*, E. T. by W. H. Kent, O.S.C., I. 392; *Catholic Encyc.*, XII. 270.
- 7 *Eccl. Hist.* III. 2, 38.
- 8 *Ibid.*, IV, V. 11, 24.
- 9 Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 1932 ed., 57b.
- 10 *De praescr. heret.* 36.
- 11 *Ep.* iv. 8, 2; Labbe, *Concilia*, Paris, 1672, ii. 1029.
- 12 *Ep.* cxxxii, 3; *Contra Faustum Manich.*, xxviii. 2; Migne P. L. xlii. 485.
- 13 *Ep.* vii, *ad Episcopos Tusciae*, Migne P. L. lix. 598.
- 14 Tertullian, *de Praescr. heret.* XXVII; Migne P. L. ii. 40; *de virg. vel.* i Migne P. L. ii. 889; referring especially to St John 14, 15.
- 15 Cp. Pope Pius XII in *Menti nostrae*, 23 Sept. 1950, *sacerdos Christi partes agit.*
- 16 Mansi viii. 184; Hardouin ii. 942.
- 17 Mansi xiv. 647, 814-5.
- 18 Reaffirmed by Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 29 June 1943.
- 19 But perhaps of Carthage; E. W. Benson, *Cyprian* (1897), pp. 29-31.
- 20 *De pudicitia*, 1.
- 21 J. R. Palanque, etc., *The Church in the Roman Empire* (E. T., 1948), pp. 703-5.
- 22 Du Cange, *Glossarium*, and Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* s. v. "pontifex".
- 23 *Contra Julianum Pelagianum* I. 13; Migne P. L. xlv. 648.
- 24 Dom. P. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, Paris, 1721, col. 326.
- 25 *Ibid.* col. 395 (A.D. 347).
- 26 *Ibid.* col. 474 (A.D. 474).
- 27 *Ibid.* col. 558 (A.D. 382).
- 28 *Ibid.* col. 810 (A.D. 407).
- 29 *Ibid.* 1031 (A.D. 422).
- 30 *Collectio Avellana*, ed. O. Günther, Vienna, 1895, p. 83.
- 31 *Oxford Lib. of Fathers*, vol. XII, letters 4, 12, 14, 35, 139.
- 32 J. B. Lightfoot, *Ignatius* I. 623.
- 33 Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* IV. 2.
- 34 See Lightfoot, *Ignatius* II. 311, III. 413.
- 35 Socrates IV. 2.
- 36 Coustant, col. 448.
- 37 *Ibid.*, col. 487.

- 38 *Oxford Lib. of Fathers*, vol. XII, letters 158, 171.
- 39 *Early History of the Christian Church*, E. T. 1912, II. 366.
- 40 Duchesne, loc. cit.
- 41 Socrates, VII. 9.
- 42 Ibid., VII. 11.
- 43 P. Hughes, *History of the Church*, II. 70.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 A.D. 544, Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ed. J. B. Bury, 1909, IV. 430, note.
- 46 Coustant, 1007; *Coll. Avellana* pt. II, 63.
- 47 Hardouin I. 1466, 7.
- 48 *Oxford Lib. of Fathers*, vol. XII, letter 29.
- 49 Hardouin II. 799; Mansi VII. 960. A.
- 50 Hardouin III. 8, 46.
- 51 Hughes, II. 70, 71.
- 52 For 203 years out of the 462 between the first and seventh general councils, Mgr. L. Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome*, E. T. 1907, p. 281.
- 53 Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith, cap. 1.
- 54 Encyclical on Education, 1929.
- 55 Correspondence in Cmd. 3588 of 1930; (the Cardinal Secretary of State who signed this Pro-Memoria became Pope Pius XII).
- 56 W. Ullmann, *The Origins of the Great Schism*, 1948, p. 6.
- 57 Hughes, III. 310.
- 58 "We call ourselves, he said, not a part of the Church but the entire Church, and that is disputed by the English Protestants", Abbot C. Butler, *The Vatican Council*, 1930, vol. I, 278-280.

## ECUMENICITY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

RICHARD PARSONS

AN IMPORTANT book has recently come into circulation again; it is a new latin edition of *De Pace Fidei* by Nicolas of Cusa. It is of great consequence as the first attempt at a discussion between the world religions with a view to their mutual understanding. The work is a remarkable attempt to offer a positive and constructive starting point in solving the major problems of a world divided by politics and religion.

Nicolas was the fifteenth-century Cardinal and Bishop of Brixen in the Tyrol; and he was a highly original philosopher and eirenic theologian as well as an important ecclesiastical statesman. Outside a small circle of scholars and students Nicolas does not seem to have had as yet the appreciation he deserves; and so a brief summary of his life and times will help to assess his work.

He was born in 1401 at Kues on the river Moselle and probably educated at the famous school of the Brothers of the Common Life at Deventer where Thomas à Kempis and Erasmus had been scholars. In 1416 he became a member of Heidelberg University and in the next year entered the renowned University of Padua where, it seems, he was greatly influenced by several outstanding members of the staff. After getting his doctorate in canon law at the age of twenty-three he had the good fortune to be made secretary to Cardinal Orsini who had already noted Nicolas' interests; and he was early marked out for ecclesiastical diplomacy. His subsequent career can only be understood fully against the political and religious background of his time. Ideas of general councils, as the best means of healing the schisms of Christendom, had been developing since the fourteenth century; and this movement had significant influence on political thought in the fact that it was the first public discussion of constitutionalism and absolutism. The conciliar movement in fact prepared and spread ideas which



emerged in later struggles, and the remote effects have not yet spent themselves.

It was in the full tide of councils of reform that Nicolas came into prominence, notably at the Council of Basle in 1431 which he attended primarily to handle an appeal for the Archbishop of Treves. He lost his case and became a defender of Pope Eugenius IV, by whom he was nominated Cardinal *in petto* in 1446. His early writings emerge in connection with the Council of Basle and are concerned with Catholic Harmony and the Authority of General Councils, although he leaves in doubt whether ultimate power is rested in the Pope or in the Council. The superiority of the Council lies in the fact that it represents better than any individual can the agreement or consent of the whole Church. Nicolas argues, on the authority of the canonists, that approval or acceptance by the community is an essential ingredient of law; and such approval is shown by usage or custom. A council speaks with more authority than an individual, and in this general sense all government rests on consent. Therefore government is properly a "harmony" or *concordantia*—a co-operative enterprise—according to Nicolas, and not a delegation of powers from a sovereign head. Harmony and co-operation absorbed his thought, and the earliest of his philosophical works, *Concerning Learned Ignorance*<sup>2</sup>, illustrates his profound belief that absolute being is the reconciliation of opposites. This passion for unity, harmony, and reconciliation was characteristic of his whole thought and system. He worked untiringly for political unity in the Europe of his day and for peace amid the ecclesiastical strife of Christendom. But Nicolas had a world view, and he advocated unity of political and religious beliefs among the different nationalities.

It is in the book *Concerning Peace or The Harmony of Faith* that Nicolas tried to work out a pattern on which unity of the great religions of the world might be achieved. The occasion of the writing was probably the advance of the Turks on Constantinople, which disturbed the whole of Christendom and not least Nicolas, who had been engaged on a Papal mission in the city in 1438. The Turks overcame the city in 1453, and it was probably that year or slightly before that Nicolas wrote this short treatise on lasting peace and religious unity. Its spirit is less dogmatic and more persuasive than a later tract, the *Cribratio Alchorani* which was produced at the instigation of the Pope, Pius II, perhaps in 1460-1 to refute the

errors of Islam. Nicolas is obviously well acquainted with the Qur'an, and he shows that Muhammad had obtained his ideas of Christianity from a perverted form of it. At the same time he praised the literary value of the Qur'an while rejecting the unacceptable elements. Although the book is critical it is not entirely negative and destructive; Nicolas really attempts a comparative study of Islam and Christianity for the Pope and his advisers at a constructive level, as Pius was seriously hoping to convert the leader of the Turkish armies, and, of course, subsequently his followers. But *De Pace Fidei* offers a conciliatory and positive answer to a world divided in politics and religion.

It begins with a reference to the troublous times caused by fear of the dreaded Turk and the rivalry of religion. "A certain man", Nicolas of course, during a meditation saw a vision of the ultimate harmony of mankind and lasting religious peace. He then prays to God, "the giver of all good to his creatures who has formed man from the dust and breathed into him a rational spirit which, at the moment does not see the light, that the eyes of men's minds might be raised to their Creator, and so be reunited to him by love sublime as at length to return to their divine origin". The visionary sees that "the very diversity of religious customs, messengers, and times has become at last so established that eventually each separate community prefers its own idea of faith. The result is that God is worshipped by different rites and under different names." The fact is that "no creature is able to comprehend or picture the Creator who is unknown and ineffable. . . . But God is able to reveal himself, and if he deigns to do so then war, hatred and evil will cease." Then shall all men know "that there is but one religion with a variety of rites".

Nicolas continues: "All men agree with this prayer, and God, who sat on his throne, spoke to man who had been given freewill; but man at present was held down by the Prince of Darkness and directed his life by sense and not by the interior light. So God sent different prophets and seers to recall wandering man; and when these messengers were not able to overcome the Prince of darkness, finally God sent his Word (Christ) clothed in human nature to redeem mankind. Since the Word became a moral man, and in his flesh displayed the witness of the truth, doubtless man has the capacity for eternal life and ought to possess it. What more could God do for man?" Then the Word made flesh pleads to the Father

of mercy on behalf of mankind that the diversity of religions might be reduced to one orthodox faith. This pleases the King of Heaven, and in spiritual ecstasy the wisest men of the world are addressed by the Word who says that God has heard the cries of all who suffer because of the diversity of religions. And because all men in the various ways are trying to please God their Creator, the Lord himself is ready, with the common consent of mankind, to harmonize the differing religions into one unique faith. This is a task for the wise men who are called in to assist in this purpose, and the place reckoned most suitable for the final reunion of men in the one faith is Jerusalem.

Then opens the discussion with the different religious representatives and nationalities which will guide the "wise men" in their mission; and they are instructed by the Word, St Peter, and St Paul in turn. A Greek begins by asking the Word how the proposed unity of religion is to be presented, as each nation will find it hard to accept another faith in place of the one it has fought for. The Word corrects him first of all by insisting that it is not "another faith" but the "one faith which is really presupposed by everyone". For instance, all men love wisdom; and this presupposes the existence of wisdom itself; and this in turn cannot be unless wisdom is one, simple, and the source of all that is. The Italian quibbles about the expression "wisdom" but the Word informs him and the Greek that obviously wisdom existed before creation and is therefore eternal. The Arab joins in and so far agrees, "Nothing truer or clearer can be said"; but he wants to know about idolaters and polytheists. The answer to him is that even such believers presuppose the divine being; it is what worshippers fundamentally recognize and confess behind all their gods. Further they all admit a First Cause, the Principle and Creator of the Universe. If, therefore, so-called polytheists worship the deity implicitly in everything that they give the name of God to, then strife can be avoided. Men can give their sincerest worship to God and, at the same time, not contradict this by respecting and invoking saints and lesser beings.

The Hindu then asks if images and pictures of God should be destroyed. The Word replies that they can be tolerated in so far as they lead to the worship of the true God. It is difficult to avoid images altogether because they are used to secure oracles, and certain priests claim special powers of interpretation (although the results are put ambiguously lest they should be discredited). The

best thing would be to get rid of idols eventually; and the Word adds that this should not be more difficult for Hindus to do this than it was for Greeks and Romans. But the Hindu has a serious difficulty in the idea of the Trinity, especially when he thinks of his own *trimurti*, where the divine persons are merely partners in the godhead. In reply the Word emphasizes that the Trinity does not mean that there are three absolutes; there can only be one absolute. The Chaldean then observes that such abstruse matters cannot be understood by ordinary folk, scarcely by wise men. While he does not dissent from the Word's explanation of the Trinity, he says that what really troubles him (and the Arab too) is the claim that God has a Son. The Word answers that the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit express real distinctions in the Godhead, and conveniently signify the Trinity because the Son comes from the Father, and Love or the Spirit comes from the unity and equality of the Son. The Jew then remarks that although he is aware that a Trinity implies some plurality, nevertheless he agrees with the others that a full idea of the unity of God does intellectually imply a Trinity. The Scythian likewise agrees that all wise men everywhere have arrived at some idea of the Trinity in Unity. The Frenchman gives qualified support to this argument but adds that the problem is really, how can we reach agreement about the Word made flesh for the redemption of the world. Some accept it; others deny it.

The Word bids them listen to St Peter, who tries to show that we cannot deny that the Word of God is divine and that those who admit that Christ is the Word incarnate must therefore confess that he is God. St Peter is then asked by a Persian how can God who is without change become a man, how can the Creator become a creature, the Infinite finite, the Eternal temporal? The reply is that if the Persian admits that Christ is the Word of God then it follows that he must confess that Christ is also God. The Persian is prepared to admit that Christ is the greatest of all the prophets and that God put his Word in him; but even so he does not seem to be able to go further than admitting that the union of God and Christ is one of grace, and that Christ is the holiest of men. He notices that the Arabs affirm many high qualities to Christ in the Qur'an; and this fact should not raise serious obstacles to religious harmony. But the Persian thinks that the Jews will find it more difficult to accept Christ than other believers since they have expressed no opinion



about him. St Peter assures him that the Jews have all the truth about Christ in their scriptures; but the real hindrance is that the Jews are tied to a literal interpretation of their own writings. St Peter's opinion is that Jewish reluctance will not exclude harmony; in any case he feels that their numbers are quite small and they could not disturb the world by force of arms. This is a very interesting comment and is an important admission by Nicolas that his purpose is mainly political; that is to say he was hoping to conciliate nations who, by divided beliefs, could by their military strength bring the nations to war. Nicolas does not intend to exclude the Jews in his scheme of religious harmony; but he is at pains to construct world peace on the basis of a common philosophy of religion.

Next St Peter replies to questions from a Syrian on belief in Christ, to a Spaniard on the difficulties of the Virgin Birth and to a Turk on the stumbling block of the Crucifixion. St Peter argues that Christ died for truth and obedience, and that by his resurrection the immortality of mankind was declared. How, concludes St Peter, could this be better proved to the whole world than by Christ's voluntary death and resurrection, which again is presupposed by the universal belief of mankind in an after-life? The German suggests that the Jews are not concerned with an eternal kingdom but only a temporal one; but St Peter is convinced that their devotion to their religion involves eternal and not merely temporal happiness.

At this point the Tartar states that the real crux is the wide variety of rites and ceremonies, even for instance about marriage—some believe in monogamy, others not. He thinks that unity is impossible in view of this and unless there is agreement religious persecution will continue. The matter is taken up by the Apostle Paul with his insistence that fundamentally the soul's salvation depends on faith. That is why Abraham is the father of all believers whether they are Jews, Christians, or Arabs. Rites and ceremonies expressing this may vary; but what matters is the faith that the rites signify. The Tartar assents to most of Paul's views about Christ and eternal life, but he queries whether faith alone is sufficient. Paul replies that no one can please God without faith, yet at the same time action is always necessary unless faith is to die. If a man claims to believe in God he keeps his commandments. The Tartar agrees so far, but he wants to know how agreement can be reached on God's

commandments, since there appear to be different views on the matter: Jews claim to have obtained God's commands through Moses, Christians through Christ, Arabs through Muhammad, and probably other religions through their leaders. Paul's reply is that the divine commands are brief and known to all men: they are quite simply, love to God in the soul, and the complement, to do to others what we wish to be done to ourselves—which is love to man. The Tartar and his friends accept this; but he himself is still hesitant about rites, especially circumcision which he cannot believe is a divine ordinance. Paul realizes the difficulty about circumcision but he is confident that it is faith that saves, and he thinks that the best solution is peace through faith, and, over all, the law of love. Toleration of different rites and ceremonies must be practised by all.

This moves an Armenian to raise the question of baptism, which Christians regard as essential. Paul explains that baptism is a sacrament of faith and that a believer signifies his confession of faith through baptism. A Bohemian is of the opinion that the Christian Eucharist will be the main difficulty; Christians will not abandon it since Christ instituted it. Furthermore it is not easy for non-Christians to accept the Eucharist since they cannot believe in the change of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. St Paul then tries to show the spiritual nature of the Eucharist; just as men need daily food for their bodies so they feed on Christ under the sacramental signs to receive eternal life. When asked by the Bohemian how the change of the bread into the Body of Christ is effected Paul claims that believers know that the Word of God in Christ Jesus takes men out of the misery of this life to sonship with God and eternal life because nothing is impossible to God. If men thus hope and believe, then they can accept that the bread and wine can be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The Bohemian is impressed, but he tells Paul that these mysteries will not be acceptable to everyone and that some religions will shrink from believing it and partaking of the Eucharist. Paul realizes how others feel about the Eucharist, and he actually goes so far as to say that this sacrament, which has outward forms, is not absolutely necessary to salvation because the primary consideration is to believe, and thus, in a spiritual manner, to eat the bread of life. Paul says that for that very reason there is no hard and fast rule of who should, and when they should, receive the sacrament. And a

believer who feels unworthy to approach the King's Table will be commended for his humility. The best plan is for local churches to make their own arrangements so long as the peace of faith is not broken. Finally Paul is asked about other sacraments, marriage, confirmation, and extreme unction, and he replies with the same general principle—men must be considered in their time and circumstances. To demand exact agreement by everybody will probably disturb peace. As regards monogamy it appears to be a law of nature; concerning priesthood, most religions seem to have one. When asked about fasting and ecclesiastical duties Paul suggests that where agreement cannot be found men must do as they think best as long as faith and peace are preserved. Religious devotion will be strengthened as men try to serve God more faithfully through their own local customs.

The discussion then concludes with the observation that these matters have been investigated by the wisest men among the nations, and many books have been written in every language about the diversity of religions, for example by Marcus Varro in Latin and Eusebius among the Greeks. For Nicolas it is quite clear that the differences in religion have for the most part been confined to rites and ceremonies rather than to the actual worship of the One God who, from the beginning has been acknowledged by all men at all times; and he claims that the unity of religions is the divine will for man. The King of Heaven therefore has ordered the wise men to return to their own countries and to recall their nations to the unity of true worship. In due time they are to reassemble at Jerusalem as a common centre, and to accept the one faith in the name of all nations, and above all to establish perpetual peace so that the Creator is praised for ever in the peace of faith.

<sup>1</sup> Nicolai de Cusa, *De Pace Fidei*. Raymundus Klibansky et Hildebrandus Bascour, O.S.B. Londinii, in aedibus Instituti Warburgiani. MCMLVI.

<sup>2</sup> K. H. Volkmann-Schluck, *Nicolaus Cusanus, Die Philosophie im Ubergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (V. Klostermann, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1957), has made a careful study of the whole of Nicolas' system. An English translation of *De Docta Ignorantia* was made in 1954 by Fr Germain Heron and published by Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

# REASON WITHOUT REVELATION

T. H. CROXALL

THE FACT that the publishers have thought it worth while to issue a new impression of Julian Huxley's *Reason without Revelation* nearly a generation after its first publication, suggests that it will carry weight still in some quarters. Mr Huxley is a sincere intellectual and logical inquirer; so intellectual that he eliminates God altogether because God is not the conclusion of a logical proposition. He will accept nothing without "proper evidence", and by "proper" he means evidence deduced from empirical experience as he sees this to be. He looks at the human scene and assesses very ably something of its scientific, artistic, literary, metaphysical, and even religious achievements, though this latter at any rate from outside. Such great human possibilities seem revealed, that Mr Huxley concludes that man has enough intelligence, goodness, and power to lift himself, in time, nearer to perfection; and that by means of what he calls "evolutionary humanism". It is Pelagianism in a not-too-new dress.

Now the conclusion reached by Christianity is different. It too scrutinizes the human scene with no less acumen (through its adherents who are scientists, artists, metaphysicians, etc.) than Mr Huxley. It says that man, though he has much good in him, is incapable, by himself, of reaching the heights. I believe this to be the correct estimate, and in such short space as I have, I would try to examine where Mr Huxley in the main seems to go wrong. I may say straight away that he goes wrong in ignoring a good deal of human experience as irrelevant or false—I mean the experience of practising Christians, which experience Mr Huxley knows nothing of—Mr Huxley is rather like an astronomer, say, who should insist on ignoring a large area of the heavens.

## "PROPER EVIDENCE"

To Mr Huxley, that evidence is alone "proper" which is concerned with "brute fact" and the intellectual appropriation of this.



He is rather like a man standing on the bank watching a swimmer yet refusing to swim; scrutinizing and registering everything connected with swimming, yet refusing to accept the statement of the swimmer that he is cleansed, revived, and reinstated by the experience; even refusing to admit that water does it all as nothing else can. The analogy is of course imperfect, but at least the "water", so to say, of the Spirit and spiritual experience, means as much to the Christian as literal water to the swimmer; and Mr Huxley wants to say it is all illusion. But why exclude what the user of the "water" says, as evidence? We must do Mr Huxley the justice to note that while he denies God, he does accept the "numinous" in man, and the *mysterium tremendum* outside him. But he wants either to see this latter pantheistically located in the material world, or as discoverable by man alone from observation of the material world and of the human scene. But spiritual realities are not discoverable by observation. Like a modest maid, they retire when merely gazed upon.

#### GOD AND GODS

But secondly, Mr Huxley fails to see that the various conceptions of god, for which he uses a small g, are qualitatively different from what Christianity calls God. What Mr Huxley says about the gods of paganism is largely true for the Christian also. But "comparative religion" (why do people, including Mr Huxley, use this phrase when they mean the comparison of religions?) tends to make people equate the lower with the higher. Mr Huxley is rightly worried by the alleged miracle-working power in various religions of relics and holy places. Alas, Christianity, in its unreformed presentation is not free from this. Yet even the Christian attaches spiritual importance to bread and wine in the context of Holy Communion. How does he justify this? Largely because he believes Jesus told him to do so. But the reason Jesus did this is undoubtedly because he saw the material world as the sacrament of the spiritual. Plato in his way did the same. This means that both Plato and Jesus (with his followers) are dualists in one sense; and this is precisely what Mr Huxley does not want. He wants a unitary explanation of Reality, as Hegel and the neo-Hegelians have done before him. There is this much in common between Mr Huxley and the Christian view, that at least the Christian view does not hold the dichotomy unbridgeable. The God/man Jesus bridges the gulf between Time and

Eternity, and between God and man. But Mr Huxley does not admit eternity in the Christian sense, nor God either. He is fair enough not to dismiss the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, but he calls it "a brilliant device of Christian theology", as though theology had invented it. Does the builder of an electric plant invent electricity? Suppose the Trinity has after all been revealed, in spite of Mr Huxley's rejection of revelation. Revelation, like God himself, is a hypothesis. But so too is Mr Huxley's denial of God equally a hypothesis. Why should one be right and the other wrong? And if there is a God, why should he not reveal himself? And if so why not in his own way and not in the way Mr Huxley wants, namely through the intelligence? Christianity says God reveals himself to faith; but such a faith is to Mr Huxley absurd. Christianity has also been heard to say "*Credo quia absurdum*"; but only in the sense that the intellect cannot solve everything. What it cannot solve, basically the mystery of the God/man, and all that this implies, is not contrary to reason and therefore silly, but beyond reason and therefore sublime; bringing with it a fuller understanding than ever the intellect by itself could achieve. So the Christian equally truly says "*Credo ut intelligam*", I believe in order to understand.

### THE GIFT OF POWER

Mr Huxley says he has been relieved by his rejection of Christianity. We must accept his word as to how he feels. But it is at least as open for the Christian to wonder if he is not as self-deceived as he thinks the Christian is. What Mr Huxley regards as a fetter on the Christian is the statement that man is "born in sin, born damned, by nature evil". That we are born damned is a doctrine held by nobody. Even extreme Calvinists would say that some are saved. But that we are born with a propensity to evil is a fact that even Mr Huxley must needs admit. Mr Huxley wants to be rid of evil by wafting it away. The Christian, with deeper insight, sees this impossible. Man, unlike the animals, is aware of mystery; and he is aware too that his self, a bundle of internal relationships related also to the Power that created the self (and even Mr Huxley must admit that Power, seeing Mr Huxley did not create himself) is awry. Inside, and before the Power, all is not well with man. The Christian calls this disrelationship sin. If man can put this right by himself, it is at least strange that he has not hitherto succeeded in doing so. And if the modern scientific achievements are, as Mr

Huxley would have us believe, going to do it for us, how comes it that we are in worse danger of destruction and misery than ever before through the discoveries of science? Not that those discoveries are wrong. But unless the will of man is changed and purified in the way Christianity changes and purifies it (which is a fact of experience Mr Huxley knows nothing of) we are indeed in sad case.

But Mr Huxley does less than justice to human personality, though he imagines the opposite. Christianity offers no El Dorado on earth, as Communism for example does, or as Mr Huxley seems to think the advance of science will do. We need something more than science, or anything else earth can give, to achieve the fulness of our personality. And this Christianity gives us in its doctrine of Eternity, both here and hereafter. Not that there is any ultimate opposition between Christianity and science. It is Mr Huxley's fundamental fallacy (or rather one of them) to think so. Let science go on its triumphant way of discovery. It can never, as multitudes of scientists other than Mr Huxley are coming to see increasingly, destroy Christianity; and the two can live quite happily together. For science deals with what is quantitative and mechanistic; religion emphasizes, as art does too in its way, what is qualitative and spiritual. True, between the quantitative and the qualitative there is a gulf fixed. You can never arrive from one to the other *uno tenore*. You can only cross the gulf by making the venture of faith. Having made that venture, you know there is no essential antagonism.

But it is a venture to which man does not invite himself. He is invited to it by some Power outside his own unruly self; a Power which religion calls God. What sort of a God? Christianity points to the Cross of Christ by way of answer, and says that this represents not a mere temporal event over and done with, but God's eternal self-giving, as Love supreme, to man. Mr Huxley rejects the invitation, and so knows nothing of the power of it. His upbringing, as he tells us in a biographical chapter, has all been in an environment of scepticism. The relief he feels through rejecting Christianity, can hardly therefore be due to prayer and Christian spiritual exercises. It is a largely intellectual relief. Christianity is certainly paradox to the intellect, but it can never be proved to be nonsense. For it has in it a power of redemption and regeneration which Mr Huxley knows nothing of. His efforts to rationalize

Christian teaching, for example the central doctrine of the Trinity, are nothing new. In their very form they are nearly all to be found in the eighteenth-century Rationalists and elsewhere. And as for progress by "evolutionary humanism", Mr Huxley in propounding this sounds strangely Darwinian. Of course Darwin is not wholly wrong. There is something in evolution. But *progress* by mere evolution, in any deeper ethical or religious sense, has been long proved an illusion (for example Schweitzer has taught us so), in spite of people's wistful clinging to the hope.

But the greatest stumbling-block presented by Mr Huxley's new religion is that it is still in the future. It is not yet "evolved", and he says that he does not know what it will be. How long then have we to wait? Nobody knows. But meantime everybody has to live. Christianity is in the Now, and is available for everybody. We cannot *afford* to wait.

# CHRISTIAN IDEOLOGY AND THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS

W. MONTGOMERY WATT

IN THINKING about a Christian ideology for the present age it is important to remember that this is not a matter which concerns only Britain. Its repercussions go far beyond the English-speaking peoples, even beyond the whole Western world. A Christian ideology in 1958 must be an ideology for the whole of mankind. The following reflections are an elaboration of this point. They are based mainly on a knowledge of the Islamic world, but there are many similarities in the reactions of the great non-Christian religions to the impact of Western civilization, and, with a few small changes, what is true of one is true of all.

At the present time competent observers are noticing a certain resurgence in all the great world-religions. It is difficult, however, to know how far this is a genuine religious revival and how far a mainly political movement. In Islam, so far as public statements by Muslims go, together with the reports of external observers, the revival is still outward and political. It is a kind of patriotism. In Islam it is specially easy for this to happen, for Islam has a great imperial tradition. The modern Western-educated Muslim is aware of the great superiority of the West in science and technology, and knows that the Islamic countries will have to make superhuman efforts if they are to attain something like equality. When this awareness produces a mood of depression, it is encouraging to him to remind himself that there was a time when Islam had a high civilization, although Europe was still barbaric (at least in its material culture), and America was the home only of Red Indians.

This Islamic patriotism, as it may be called, need have nothing to do with religion. You will hear a young Muslim biologist arguing vigorously against a fellow-Muslim that God does not exist. He is a Muslim in the sense that that is the religion into which he was born. He has no intellectual belief in the doctrines of Islam. Yet, the same man, if he hears some Islamic custom or institution



criticized by a non-Muslim, will defend it just as vigorously. He does not believe in Islam as a religion, but for all that he is deeply moved by Islamic patriotism.

There is a vast difference between being proud of a religion in this way and finding in its scriptures and in its tradition of piety nourishment for one's soul and guidance for one's conduct in this present world. The majority of Western-educated Muslims are like the biologist. They have a strong Islamic patriotism, but the religion that dominates their lives is some form of Western secularism and materialism. If they think at all on the deeper questions of life, their guide is someone like Bertrand Russell. There are just a few—usually men whose education has been humanistic and not scientific—who have read widely in Western psychology, sociology, and philosophy, and then have turned back to the Qur'an and the religious classics of Islam in the hope of being able to distil from them in a modern form the quintessence of Islamic doctrine, so that this may be the foundation for a rebuilding of the Islamic world. These are earnest and thoughtful young men, but it is clear that so far their inspiration has come mainly from the West, and that they are turning to the Qur'an only to find support and justification for ideas that are essentially Western.

The fact that there are such stirrings among young Muslims is one of some significance. No one is yet able to say what will come of it. Damp wood is not good for a bonfire, and it only smokes at first; but, if there is sufficient heat, in due course the fire will burst into flame. In Islam at the present time there is some smoke, but the fire has not yet blazed up. No young Muslim has thoroughly assimilated the thinking of the West and then returned to find in the basic conceptions of Islam the inspiration for dynamic action. There is no Islamic ideology for the present day, and it is difficult to see how one is even possible. Yet the Christian student of these matters must remember that he has no infallible knowledge of God's purposes in particular, and that, if God wills a revival of Islam, he is capable of bringing it about. We do not know what is happening in the secret hearts of Muslims, and that is where religious revivals take place. What we may be certain about is that the fire has not yet burst into a blaze.

There is another way in which the gap might be bridged between traditional Islam and modern Western thought, namely, from the side of the Islamic theologians. Towards the end of the nineteenth

century a notable Egyptian scholar, Muhammad Abduh, published a restatement of Islamic doctrine intended to bring it closer to Western thought. To the Western reader the actual progress made in this direction seems infinitesimal, but that it should even have been attempted is important. Unfortunately Muhammad Abduh has had no real successor, and it now seems unlikely that the gap will be bridged from the side of traditional theology. Muhammad Abduh was head of the ancient university of the Azhar in Cairo, the chief centre in the whole world for traditional Islamic studies, but, despite his reforming zeal, it was so fixed in its ways that not until a decade ago was a knowledge of a European language regarded as essential for leading professors. Until that time the Islamic theologians, with a handful of exceptions, if they wanted to grapple with modern thought had to rely on a few bad translations and expositions in Arabic. They really lived in a world of their own, almost completely shut off from the intellectual life of the modern West, and were not in a position to respond seriously to this aspect of the challenge of the age.

The dangers inherent in this seclusion of the Islamic theologians are seen in their full extent against the background of the general educational situation in the Islamic world. The Azhar university is the culmination of one whole system of education, but alongside it in most Islamic countries there is a second and completely different system of education, based on Western principles. The cleavage goes back to the primary stage. In the Western system of education, which is that now supported by the various governments, the primary schools are much the same as our own; but there are still many village-schools of the traditional type where learning to read is combined with learning the Qur'an by heart. From the government or Western schools there comes a stream of young men and women to swell the Western-educated middle-class. This class is of the highest importance, for without it a country like Egypt could not function as a modern State. The present government of Egypt and Syria is first and foremost the representative of this class, which, until the Egyptian Revolution, felt that it had not a share of power and wealth commensurate with its importance.

A Western-educated middle class of this kind is to be found in all the chief Asian and African countries. In the Islamic lands of the Middle East, however, the cleavage is at its greatest between this middle class and the upholders of the traditional religion. Indians

from a Hindu background are also greatly influenced by the Western scientific outlook with its accompaniments of secularism and materialism. In Islam, however, there has been in addition an age-long suspicion of Christianity which goes back to the time when the Arabs had just conquered Syria and Iraq and had to live among Christians of greatly superior education. This suspicion of everything Christian has adversely affected the Muslims in two ways. In the early nineteenth century when the Middle East was beginning to be interested in European education, the Muslim theologians would have nothing to do with it because of its Christian associations. At the same time those Muslims who overcame their theological scruples about Western education, and perhaps went abroad to study at a European university, tended to read the works of secular, agnostic, atheistic, and anti-Christian writers, and to avoid those of Christians, for they failed to realize that the former writers were not merely anti-Christian, but usually anti-religious as well, and therefore anti-Islamic.

From the point of view of missionary thinking there are three groups of special importance in the lands of the great non-Christian world-religions. These are the traditional theologians, the Western-educated middle classes, and the masses of the people. The last are mostly faithful to the old religion, though they have often incorporated practices which the strict theologian finds it difficult to justify. They are the group among whom nearly all the Christian missionary work has been done. This is not merely because they constitute the bulk of the population, but because only men with special qualifications could tackle the other groups. On occasion there have been arguments with non-Christian theologians, and in the last decade or two some more friendly and eirenic contacts. There have been a number of approaches to the middle class, but it has often been by a man whose main energies were directed to other ends. With the continued growth of this Western-educated middle class and the increase in its influence, the time would seem to have come when more thought should be given to the Christian approach to it.

In most countries it is probably not far wrong to say that about nine-tenths of this middle class bases its general attitude to life on the Western scientific outlook (in so far as it has a conscious attitude), and that it is thoroughly secular and worldly-minded. In dealing with this class, therefore, the Christian is not much helped

by studying Islam, Buddhism, or Hinduism. Advanced study of this kind is needed if one is going to deal with the theologians, and a certain minimum of study is desirable in order to deal effectively with the masses. But it does not help much to speak to the middle classes in terms of al-Ghazali when their serious reading, if they do any, is Bertrand Russell!

This question is far more urgent than most Westerners realize. These men and women are faced with many serious problems, and they are looking for an ideology to guide them. Their countries, for the most part, have entered only recently into the full swing of modern political life. There are many points at which their inherited political wisdom gives them no help, even if in other parts of the political game they have something to teach the West. Then, in their individual lives, there are many changes to which they have to adapt themselves, not least through the attraction of certain Western ideals of conduct as presented in personal contacts and by the cinema. In their bewilderment they are looking for a fairly coherent system of thought, which will be intellectually satisfying as an account of the universe and of man's place in it, and which will also lead to practical programmes and to a desirable ordering of society. In short, they are in quest of an ideology. Their own theologians can do nothing to help them here. The various modernizing movements in the old religions still have only a limited appeal. The only serious attempt to fill the vacuum is the Marxist one.

This is not to belittle the devoted labours and considerable achievements of Christian missionaries. These labours and achievements, however, belong rather to other sectors. The problem of the middle class, in its present extent and urgency, is something new. Christianity has a fairly coherent system of thought, but the form in which it is usually stated makes no appeal to the man of Russellian outlook; and Christianity gives guidance on matters of personal conduct, but on other practical matters its voice is hesitant and uncertain. The development of a Christian ideology is thus urgent, not merely for our own country, but for an important class in the non-Christian world.

One requisite of such a Christian ideology is that it should start from the modern scientific outlook. This does not mean that it should simply accept that outlook. In any case there is some vagueness about what precisely the scientific outlook is. A Christian



ideology would accept the attitudes and methodological principles which constitute the scientific outlook in so far as they are seen to be sound and true. It would almost certainly be found that there is a sphere where the scientific outlook is inappropriate, and this sphere would have to be exactly marked off. Then, on the basis of this partial acceptance of scientific attitudes and principles, the attempt would be made to restate or reformulate the great truths of the Christian faith—not so as to alter the facts in any way, since they are unalterable, but by way of translating them, as it were, into the idiom of modern scientific man.

It is not necessary to go far into the works of Marx and Engels to discover that their thought is in a Hegelian idiom which is just as foreign to the modern scientific man as the traditional Christian idiom. Nevertheless Marxism somehow or other manages to present itself as scientific, and thereby gains an aura of intellectual respectability. The great fathers of the early centuries translated the faith into the idiom of the thinking men of their time, and it therefore should not be impossible for us to achieve a similar work of translation.

In itself, however, such a translation or adaptation is not enough. It is also necessary to show that the great truths of our religion have practical implications. In particular our fellow-men have to be shown that we have a sound analysis of mankind's present troubles, and that we are able to point to practical steps to remedy them. Now of course these points are also covered by Christian teaching. The cause of all human troubles is sin, and the practical programme to remedy them is prayer and work for the coming of God's kingdom. Unfortunately these assertions are incomprehensible to modern scientific man. The heart of the problem of developing a Christian ideology is the translation of these assertions into modern idiom.

The conception of sin is not altogether meaningless to the average modern man, but in his mind it has become so crude and jejune that it hinders as much as it aids his understanding of Christian truth. Thus he regards the doctrine of original sin as a piece of meaningless mythology, although it is fundamental to a Christian analysis of the contemporary malaise of civilization. The vast extent of the work needing to be done by Christians is becoming apparent. Not only must they discover how to express in a modern idiom what is involved in their conceptions of sin and



original sin, but they must show in detail that the general principles they have formulated are able to account in detail for the evils of our present world. The effects of sin will have to be expounded in connection with the effects of economic and social factors, and yet distinguished from them. There will probably have to be some distinction between those troubles peculiar to our own age and those which we share with all mankind at all times. In addition, what we say on these matters must be linked up with our general account of God, man, and the universe.

Corresponding to the analysis of human troubles there must be a practical programme to remedy them. We are taught by our Lord to look forward to and to pray for the hallowing of God's name, the coming of his kingdom, and the doing of his will. Even if the full realization of these is not possible in this life, yet the Christian must work for such realization of them as is possible here and now. In particular he must elaborate the conception of a universal order, a world-community, a kingdom of righteousness, in which all nations will have a due share, and in which all will be able to feel that they are achieving a satisfactory life. Once again it is the working out in detail that is important. The fundamental principles of the world order—such as the essential equality of all races and the wrongness of slavery—must be formulated with definiteness and clarity so that, even where political action is not possible, world opinion may be able to bring pressure to bear on recalcitrant States. There must also be a statement of the principles of a just order within the national community, since this is also a deep concern of the Christian, and often the point at which he is best able to make his voice heard.

The argument so far has been that a Christian ideology must be the expression of Christian truths in a modern idiom, must include an analysis of the present troubles of mankind and a practical programme to remedy them, and must have a certain logical coherence and consistency. The question now presents itself whether, as we face the Western-educated middle classes in non-Christian lands, we must present this Christian ideology as a whole, or whether we may invite them to support the practical programme without accepting the whole Christian view of the world. In other words, can a non-Christian work for the coming of the kingdom without working for the hallowing of God's name? To ask the question in this form is virtually to answer it, for ultimately the two cannot be separated.

Nevertheless in the immediate future, because of the urgency of the times, we should explore the possibility of gaining the support of non-Christians for at least some parts of the practical programme. The old conception of the law of nature gives grounds for thinking that there is a good chance of success. The conception itself, however, is out of fashion, and the important truth which it conveys would again have to be restated in a modern idiom; but this should not be so difficult as some of the other pieces of restatement which appear to be necessary.

Let us suppose, then, that the Christian ideology has been worked out. Let us suppose also that the practical programme has been formulated in such a way that it appeals to the Western-educated middle classes in the non-Christian world. Are some of the resources of the Church to be diverted from present forms of missionary work to the preaching of the new ideology to the middle classes? The answer is a fairly definite, No. Naturally, where one of our present missionaries is in contact with members of the middle class, no one will stop him discussing the new ideology with them; but such discussions will be most effective when they are a sideline. The middle classes would often be suspicious of a man whose primary function was to convert them. The most one could say would be that, where there are opportunities for work among the middle classes, it would be a good thing for a missionary society to allow a suitable man a certain amount of time for this.

There is a deeper reason, however, why no special emphasis should be placed on the preaching of the new ideology to non-Christians. An ideology is not simply a system of ideas; it is a system of ideas with practical consequences. This means that its truth is to be tested not in the realm of ideas but in the realm of practice. The non-Christian is therefore justified in saying, This is a very fine ideology in theory, but does it work in practice? It follows that the missionary must be able, not merely to commend the ideology by his words, but to show that it is being put into practice at the home base and is having satisfactory results.

The corollary of the fact that we live in "one world" is that the missionary work of the Church overseas becomes inseparable from the work at home. The commendation of the Gospel to the non-Christian is hindered unless Christians in the sending country are exerting all their strength and influence to secure the observance of the principles of their ideology in their national life. That means

strenuous effort to bring about the application of these principles where there are social tensions to be relieved, and pressure on the government to support the application of the relevant principles in the international sphere and to base its own actions on them. This, and not the sending of men or money, is the greatest contribution the Church at home can make to the spreading of the Christian faith among non-Christians.

# EVANGELICAL PARISH CLERGY, 1820-1840

ARTHUR POLLARD

WHEN we think of the Evangelical Revival, our minds usually go to the giants of the first generation, taking Elliott-Binns' dating up to about 1789.<sup>1</sup> These men were pioneers, often preaching wherever they felt called. But after their advance came the consolidation, no less essential but much less spectacular. For this phase the Church of England possessed in its order and organization certain especial virtues. Not least of these was its parochial system, for by it the devoted parish clergy might sustain and strengthen those whose faith might otherwise have been a passing and a shallow thing. The men who did this work, far more numerous than the pioneers, did it quietly, and now are all but forgotten. These were the men of the second and third generations who brought Evangelicalism to the zenith of its appeal in the mid-nineteenth century. They never formed a majority in the Church, but they were more numerous than is often supposed. Moreover, their influence was out of all proportion to their numbers, not only because of the faith that was in them, but also as a result of their organization.

Their clerical societies, dotted all over the country—London, Bristol, Elland, Creaton, Raucedon, to name only the best-known—were “cells” of activity in the areas in which they were found. One such, formed later (1816) than those I have mentioned, met at Matlock Bath twice every year (and still does) to discuss questions of interest to members. A summary of the discussions between 1822 and 1838 was made by its secretary, Henry Sim of Eyam.<sup>2</sup> From this I have tried to construct a view of the opinions and activities of a group which may be considered fairly representative of the ordinary Evangelical parish clergy of the early nineteenth-century.

Philip Gell issued his circular in September 1816, inviting evangelical clergymen in the North Midlands to meet him at the New Bath Hotel, Matlock, on 30 October 1816. Those who came were mainly young men, and mainly from Cambridge.<sup>3</sup> Gell himself

was 33, and a graduate of Trinity. Out of the first twenty-five signatures in the Society's list I have identified twenty-one, and seventeen were Cambridge men; three came from Oxford (two of whom, Pidcock and Shipley,<sup>4</sup> were much older than most of the other members). The other Oxonian was the younger Shirley (later Bishop of Sodor and Man). One member—the elder Shirley—came from Dublin.

The Society's objects were: "The Elucidation of the Word of God and the Interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom;—The Promotion of personal Holiness, Zeal and Brotherly Love;—Establishment in the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church of England;—and mutual assistance in difficult cases of parochial Ministration." I propose to examine the Society's discussions under the four heads provided by this statement.

Under the first we may note their discussion of the character of God, so reminiscent of the eighteenth century, with its consideration of his various attributes. Moxon employed the old cosmological argument that "Creation proves a Creator" (October 1823), while the elder Shirley made specific reference to Paley (October 1825, Question VI). Shirley spoke of the general goodness of God, his goodness to the sons of men in their need, especially to them that fear him, most especially in the act of redemption. Even from Sim's notes one can feel how this argument moves to a climax. There is an impassioned quality about it, which is in contrast with Hey's remarks on the justice of God (April 1825, I), dispassionate, restrained and with the orderliness, fullness, and fairness of judicial statement. Hey examined the justice of God as lawgiver (his law is reasonable), governor (the comforts of obedience and the miseries of rebellion), and judge ("in desolating nations, etc.; in afflicting the Saviour. In awfully visiting the impenitent"). He also recognizes possible objections such as guilt's escaping punishment and the affliction of the innocent Saviour. Incidentally, in the discussion of this subject Dewe's "The only boundary of God's Justice is the exercise of His will" comes near to falling under the indictment sometimes levelled against Calvinistic Evangelicals, that they made God the victim of his own caprice. Saxton supplied the corrective by noting that God's justice is intimately connected with his holiness.

The Society often sought literally to elucidate the Word of God by discussing crucial passages of Scripture. This we might expect



from the more than ordinary emphasis which Evangelicals placed on the authority of Scripture. Nevertheless, these members of the Matlock Bath Society may have been more diligent than many of their contemporaries, for in a preface to a discussion of Hebrews 9. 16-17 in the issue for February 1835 (an article which may have led to the discussion of this same text at Matlock Bath in October 1835) the editor of the *Christian Observer* wrote "We are sorry to say that even some clergymen inform us, that in these busy days, they never cut open pages in which they see Greek or Hebrew bristle in array against them" (p. 72). This in a periodical intended for Evangelicals! The crux as to the meaning of *diatheke*—"covenant" or "testament"—provoked lengthy discussion and divergent views at Matlock. Agreement was more general about 1 Corinthians 15. 28 in October 1823. Legh Richmond, a guest on one of his itineraries for C.M.S. and the Jews' Society, suggested that the text "involves the Eternal Sonship of Christ", but this was rejected out of hand. One speaker after another condemned this interpretation, and one can detect the vigour of John Simpson's retort in Sim's note: "Nothing to do with the Eternal Sonship. Refers to Mediatorial Kingdom and that will be given up when his office as Mediator (ends)".

The Society also examined Prayer Book cruces, such as the meaning of "That this child is regenerate" and of the words of committal in the Burial Service. Discussion of these in 1819 took place before Sim became secretary, and no record is therefore preserved. It is not fanciful, however, remembering Evangelical emphases, to suggest that the phrase "in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to eternal life" in the committal passage probably provoked lively discussion. Here is assurance, but of what kind? Perhaps some of those Cambridge men at Matlock Bath had heard Simeon distinguish the assurance of faith and the assurance of hope.<sup>5</sup>

We must lament the absence of reports on discussions of topics such as the above, and also on other potentially interesting subjects such as the meaning of "Natural depravity of the human Will" (April 1818). We cannot, however, even guess at what we have lost, because some of the discussions which have been reported seem to have been disappointing. Those on repentance and universal redemption fall in this group, and that on the kind and degree of Christian knowledge a person may obtain without saving faith is not much better. John Simpson made the useful distinction that

such a man may know all "theoretically but not experimentally", but the elder Shirley's "May say Sibboleth and yet not say Shibboleth" is not very helpful. This remark is, however, of two-fold value. It exemplifies the group's fidelity to Scripture, and it also shows the narrowness of the elder Shirley. The cliché, the mark of a set, unthinking attitude, reveals him (he was the son of Lady Huntingdon's relative, collaborator and controversialist against Wesley) as the "diehard" of this group, the man for whom there is only one answer, that which he has been taught, has accepted, and holds inflexibly.

The best discussion related to salvation is on universal pardon. Universalists seem to have caused some concern in the early nineteenth century,<sup>6</sup> and there is at least one instance of an Anglican clergyman being convinced by this doctrine. Samuel Hall, curate to his father at St Peter's, Manchester (the latter refused to say the Athanasian Creed and was said to incline towards Unitarianism—cf. Matlock Bath discussion in April 1818 on objections to this creed), was an extreme Calvinist Evangelical, who in 1833 became a Universalist. It is perhaps not illogical for a high Calvinist to move in this direction, believing that God's will in predestination and election might work with his all-embracing love to predestine all to life. Such an attitude would derive, however, from a partial view of Scripture on the question. In their discussion of Universalism the Matlock Bath members marshalled an impressive array of texts both in possible favour of and against the doctrine. Evangelicals are here found at their best, in their reliance upon the authority of the Bible, the knowledge they had, and the use they made of it. Discussion of cruces was therefore of primary importance. They had to take especial care rightly to divide the word of truth.

What the Matlock Bath group had to say under the second head—"The promotion of personal Holiness, Zeal, and brotherly Love"—emphasizes their sense of practical responsibility. Indeed, the link between this second and the first object is well expressed by Jowitt: "As beings of finite capacity we should ever hold the truth in a practical way . . . The practical mode I apprehend then is expressed in Article XVII. Any other tends to carelessness and presumption Psalm XXXII. 2." This is revealed in the group's treatment of prophecy. There was a certain amount of pious crystal-gazing and excessive literalism—the elder Shirley found "Earthquake in

Syria—Fire in Constantinople” as signs of the approaching end—but, on the whole, the doctrine of the latter days is accepted practically as an incentive to Christian living, a view nowhere better stated than by Shirley :

- “1. It tends to strengthen our faith in God’s promises and prophecies.
- “2. It stimulates to exertion in consideration of the approach of the time.
- “3. A blessing promised to those who look into these deep things of God. Revel. I. 3, Dan. XII. 12.
- “4. To search into these things in a proper spirit.”

This practical emphasis marks other discussions. On Christian perfection the younger Shirley notes the controversial nature of the topic, but is admirably specific in his definition of “perfect” as “Tenderness and Forbearance in proportion to our progress in Holiness. Not freedom from sin, not Angelic, Not Adamic.” Again discussions such as those on the relation of the old and new natures (October 1823) and the evidence of being filled with the love of Christ (October 1835) are marked by the eminently practical concern of men in intimate contact with souls for whom they bore a responsibility before God. There is a wealth of pastoral experience in the distinctions of Hey on the Christian character—“Universal Obedience, Submission, Self-Denial. Not trust to warm feelings, Voices or Dreams”, and in the elder Shirley’s remark on conversion —“The New birth does not gradually change the old nature but begins a new nature.”

Under the third head, “Establishment in the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church of England”, we must again regret some of the omissions. We have, for instance, nothing on Tractarianism. The nearest we may get to this subject is a reply from the younger Shirley (Archdeacon of Derby and Bishop’s Commissary) to a letter by Gell, advocating reform in the Cathedral service. Shirley advised caution, and in a passing remark wrote: “Your account of Sibthorp’s chapel is most painful. How unspiritual all that stuff is!”<sup>7</sup> Was this a reference to early ritualism?

On two subjects, however, the Matlock Bath members said things which have relevance and echoes to-day. The subjects are Convocation and the relationship of Church and State. The younger Shirley noted the disparity in representation between the dignitaries

and the ordinary clergy, and he also feared the "painful scene" that would be shown to the country if the two houses of Convocation were at variance or if both differed with Parliament (October 1833). Sim appears to have been an early advocate of disestablishment. His remarks—"Some statements of my brethren have rather startled me that the Nation should legislate for the Church"—found little, if any, encouragement among his brethren. Indeed, so contented were they with things as they were that ecumenicity found no support at Matlock Bath. Jowitt, who had worked as a C.M.S. missionary in Malta, vigorously denounced Roman Catholicism (April 1831), but his was a rather lonely voice, at any rate in contrast with the chorus of criticism directed against Methodists. This ranged, quite uninhibited, from the younger Shirley's "The Establishment must meet the wants of the Country. Not to come down to the Methodists. We can have no discipline in the Church for them either amongst Adults or Children" to Simpson's "Neither practicable nor desirable. Let them go, the less we have to do with them the better", from Wawn's "1st No Union of Interest. 2. No similarity of plans. 3. On many Doctrinal Points No agreement" to Casson's "They give the right hand of fellowship and behind are our most dangerous enemies. The tendency of substituting feeling for faith" and Barker's ungenerous "Any Conservative feeling amongst them has arisen not from love of the Church, but from Self-preservation" (April 1835). Only Harvey was mild in his comment, a fact perhaps deriving from his conversion under Methodist influence.<sup>8</sup> Out of all this prejudice there emerge two bases of objection, one a sense of ecclesiastical order, the other a dislike of excessive emotionalism.

But there were differences within the Church as well as with those outside it. This was the period of baptismal controversy, stretching from the publication of Mant's *Two Tracts* in 1815 to the final protracted and embittered climax of the Gorham affair. Evangelicals differed among themselves, some like T. T. Biddulph considering that the thanks of the Baptismal Service was for an actual regeneration, a new relationship with God, a new profession of church membership and "new means for leading to the first communication of faith and primary reception of grace", while others like John Scott thought the thanks were given for hypothetical regeneration, and that the gift spoken of was conditional and the presumption of its being given charitable.<sup>9</sup> At the Matlock



meeting in 1822 Shipley appears to have agreed with Scott, saying that "Infants are baptised representatively prospectively", while Sim believed that "Baptism was invariably connected with faith or repentance". Gell, however, in April 1827 seems to have approximated to Biddulph's view in his recognition of baptism as the symbol of admission to the visible Church.

The last of the Society's objects was "mutual assistance in difficult cases of parochial Ministration". To this end they thought often of their own preparation and fitness for the task. They listed the necessary qualities—Hey suggested "1. Love for the flock. 2. Skilful as to pasture, diseases (pride, self-delusion etc.), dangers. 3. Faithful to ungodly and believers. 4. Tenderness. 5. Vigilance. 6. Particular knowledge of our own people. 7. Patience. 8. Not soon discouraged. 9. Pattern in all things."—and also the shortcomings. The list of these suggests irresistibly an element of confession in the recital. Wawn said they went to their work "too much in the way of a business"; Saxton noted the fear of man; Robert Simpson "Want of plainness—Want of dependence upon God—Preaching in a scolding way. Too great conformity to the world"; Shirley excessively long sermons; Carr "Undue elation, undue depression, thus not leaning upon God — Impatience — Jealousy — Indolence — Exertion — Opinions of our people"; and, crowning all, Howard claimed to have listed twenty-four faults, but apparently contented himself by naming "Weekday Services in towns, listening to compliments—want of affability — Yielding to nervous feeling".

Their pastoral care was examined no less diligently than their own abilities for the task. They found the National school system "too Mechanical whilst Moral and Religious Principles are wanting" (Fisher, October 1838), and the Sunday Schools lacking "teachers imbued with the Principles" and losing their pupils in the 'teens. They had their problem of religion and the adolescent, and Sim's concern about the attraction of Beer Shops and Mechanics' Institutes is not without its modern parallels. Nevertheless, despite their anxieties, some at least saw a need and tried to supply it. On going to Whiston (near Rotherham) the younger Shirley wrote of "a clothing club to form, cottage lectures to establish throughout the hamlets, meetings of Communicants to institute, Sunday Schools to revive, a school room to build, the church to improve".<sup>10</sup>

This pastoral care did not in any way lessen the zeal for evangelism. Some of the Society's members toured for the Bible



Society and C.M.S. They were at one in their desire for the vigorous preaching of the gospel, but they were not always agreed on the best means of doing it. Barker, a firebrand in evangelistic fervour, introduced a discussion on the expectation of "such a revival of religion in our parishes as we hear of in the United States of America" (October 1835; here is another modern parallel), but the younger Shirley warned that "What would produce effects in America would not do so in England". Barker was like another Berridge, willing to defy bishops who might try to prevent his invading parishes whose ministers refused to establish Bible Associations. Barker it was also who urged the creation of a "Church Home Missionary Society", citing the wonderful achievements of similar activity in Ireland. Others opposed the idea, some advised caution, and some would have compromised with a lay agency. It required bolder faith than this before the Church Pastoral-Aid Society was eventually founded. The pristine zeal of the pioneer Evangelicals was beginning to wane.

Here we may appropriately conclude, for in this debate is summarised both the strength and weakness of these later Evangelicals. The faith of the Evangelical fathers and the spirit of self-dedication is still there, but there is also a certain loss of vigour and a lessening freshness of inspiration. There is still that wonderful energy which made the Evangelicals so influential in the nineteenth-century Church, but there are one or two ominous signs of weakness. Nevertheless, the last word must be in tribute to a body of men, faithful to God and selfless in their ministry to their fellow-men.

#### SELECT LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE MATLOCK BATH CLERICAL SOCIETY, 1816-1840

- Benjamin PIDCOCK—born 1769. Wadham, 1787. Vicar, Youlgrave, 1802-35.  
 Philip GELL (1783-1870). Trinity, Cambridge, 1800. P.C., Rocester, 1812.  
 P.C. St John's, Derby, 1829-46.  
 Guy BRYAN (1781-1870). Peterhouse, 1799. R. South Normanton, 1811-19.  
 Samuel HEY—Queens', Cambridge, 1805. V. Ockbrook, 1816-52.  
 J. G. HOWARD (1786-1862). Queens', Cambridge, 1804. V. St Michael's, Derby,  
 1816-56, and Stanton-le-Dale, 1816-62.  
 John James DEWE—possibly John Dewe, b. 1755. Brasenose, 1771. P.C. Alsop  
 and Parwich, 1816, St Peter's, Nottingham, 1824.  
 Henry SIM—born 1793. Pembroke, Cambridge, 1812. C. Eyam. C. Parwich,  
 1841-3.

- Henry John MADDOCK (1781-1826). Trinity, Cambridge, 1799. Fellow of Magdalene. C. Bonsal, 1811-16.
- Samuel SHIPLEY (1762-?1850). Wadham, 1781. V. Ashbourne, 1806-50.
- John D. WAWN—R., Stanton-le-Dale (? before J. G. Howard, see above).
- Solomon C. SAXTON—Clare, 1815.
- Robert SIMPSON—Queens', Cambridge, 1815. C. St Peter's, Derby, Min. St George's, Derby. C. Newark, 1832. P.C., Christ Church, Newark, 1837-44.
- Walter SHIRLEY (1767-?1844). Dublin B.A. 1791.
- W. Augustus SHIRLEY (1797-1847). Son of the above. New Coll., 1816. Fellow to 1828. D.D. 1846. Asst. Lec., Ashbourne, 1822. V., Shirley, 1827-46. R. Whiston, 1837-9. R., Brailsford, 1839. Archdeacon of Derby, 1841-6. Bp Sodor and Man, 1847.
- John SIMPSON (1798-?1870). Brother of Robert. St John's, Cambridge, 1817. D.D. 1839. V., Alstonfield, 1822-70.
- John Edmund CARR (1798-1872). St John's, Cambridge, 1817. P.C., Alsop, 1822. V., Darley Abbey, 1825-60.
- G. H. WOODHOUSE—St John's, Cambridge, 1819. C., St Michael's, Derby. P.C., Boulton (Derby), 1833-6. R., Finningley (Notts.), 1836-82.
- A. Auriol BARKER (1798-1853). Peterhouse, 1817. P.C., Baslow and Beeley, 1824-52.
- William JOWITT—St John's, Cambridge, 1806. Fellow, 1811-16. C.M.S., 1815-40.
- William FISHER—St Edmund Hall, 1825. C., St Peter's-cum-Normanton, Derby.
- George G. HARVEY—St John's, Cambridge, 1822. P.C., Horton (Leek), 1831-40.
- William LEEKE—Queens', Cambridge, 1825. (Ensign, 52nd Light Infantry at Waterloo). C. Brailsford, 1831-40.

<sup>1</sup> *The Early Evangelicals*, 1953, p. 5, n.1.

<sup>2</sup> For his kindness in allowing me to consult this and other documents I am indebted to the Society's present secretary, the Reverend W. J. Sawle, Vicar of Leyland.

<sup>3</sup> A short list of early members of the Society appears as an Appendix to this article.

<sup>4</sup> Neither of these is noted in Reynolds' *The Evangelicals at Oxford, 1735-1871*, 1953.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. W. Carus, *Memoir of Simeon*, 1847, p. 518.

<sup>6</sup> Cf., e.g., Crabbe's *The Borough*, Letter IV, 1810.

<sup>7</sup> *Letters and Memoir of the late Walter Augustus Shirley*, ed. Hill, 1850, p. 319—2 October 1841.

<sup>8</sup> See J. B. Dyson: *Wesleyan Methodism in the Congleton Circuit*, 1856, pp. 147-8.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Biddulph: *Baptism a Seal of the Christian Covenant*; and Scott: *An Inquiry into the Effects of Baptism*.

<sup>10</sup> *Letters and Memoirs*, p. 227—23 February 1837.

# RELIGIOUS CONVERSION IN THE CONTEXT OF PASTORAL WORK

OWEN R. BRANDON

AT THE present time the subject of religious conversion is engaging the minds of serious thinkers in a manner unprecedented since the turn of the present century. Attention is being focussed upon the subject from both the theological and the psychological points of view. Recent books of special value, written from different angles, are *This is Conversion*,<sup>1</sup> by the Archbishop of Capetown, *The Gift of Conversion*,<sup>2</sup> by Dr Erik Routley, and *Battle for the Mind*,<sup>3</sup> by Dr William Sargant. The purpose of this article is to report results of the present writer's own experimental research into the subject of conversion in relation to pastoral work. Some of the facts here recorded are already well-known, others less well-known, and some have emerged as new insights as a result of analytical study and reflection.

## THE MEANING OF CONVERSION

Perhaps the best formal definition of conversion is that given by Professor William James<sup>4</sup> over fifty years ago:

To be converted, to be regenerated, to receive grace, to experience religion, to gain an assurance, are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided, and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy, in consequence of his firmer hold upon religious realities.

If there is one word in this definition that might be questioned in the light of more recent research, it would be the word "consciously". It is now known that many of the antecedent influences leading to conversion are largely unconscious; and in many persons the conversion process itself is an unconscious process. More will be said of this later. For the present William James' definition is acceptable in general terms.

In a less formal definition of conversion, the Archbishop of Capetown uses the illustration of a spectator who is transformed into an actor. In Church he has for years watched the performance of the religious drama in the chancel; then one day something happens. His isolation is broken down; the drama reaches out to embrace him in its action; he identifies himself with it, he feels himself to be at one with God and with the worshipping family of God. He has been *converted*. And henceforth he becomes an active participator in the life of the Church.

#### ELEMENTAL FACTS ABOUT CONVERSION

Before discussing the practical aspects of our subject, it may be well to mention certain important facts. For example:

1. Conversions occur at all ages, but the experience is characteristically a phenomenon of adolescence. This is important, for adolescence is the age of decisions; it is the age at which the majority of candidates come forward for Confirmation. From a comprehensive survey of the findings of various research workers in this field, it seems safe to say that the majority of conversions occur between the years 15 to 19.

2. This is not to imply that conversions in later life are not to be expected, or are not so important when they do occur. Indeed, some of the most striking conversions occur in adult life.

3. No two conversions are alike in all their details. The conversion experience of any given individual may take one of several forms, or several contributing forces may combine to produce a complex form of the experience. The important point here is that, whatever form the experience may take, it tends to conform to the general pattern of the subject's personality, and occurs in a manner and in a form characteristic of the individual. This is so vast an aspect of the subject that it could well be developed at greater length; but here we must be content merely to state the finding as a fact.

4. Conversion, in its broadest sense, is not necessarily or essentially a *religious* experience. Moral reformation sometimes takes place without the aid of religious experience; and Dr William Sargant has shown the similarities between some forms of conversion and brain-washing. The conclusion is that the psychological processes which characterize conversion are *natural*, and not *unnatural*, processes. But we are dealing here with those changes in the

outlook, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals which occur in the context of a definitely religious experience.

### PATTERNS OF CONVERSION

1. The more one studies individuals and their conversion experience the more complex the processes appear to be, and the more fascinating the subject becomes. Sometimes conversion takes the form of the solution of a conflict. This is the type of experience most popularly in mind when conversion is discussed. But it may be something far less spectacular. In adolescence it may be rather a matter of personal acceptance of ideas already familiar to the subject. The child believes whatever he is taught to believe. And he thinks in *percepts*. His religious objects are persons and things external to himself. But when the stage of *conceptual* thinking is reached he begins to relate his religious ideas more intelligently to his own needs. He internalizes them; makes them his own; commits himself to them.

2. Thus, according to circumstances, and in accordance with the personality and needs of the subject, the conversion experience may appear to be predominantly either (a) *intellectual*—the acceptance of a new idea, or a new understanding of an old idea; in this case the conversion is characterized by a process of mental enlightenment and of spiritual understanding or (b) *emotional*—the birth of a new and dominating affection; the subject feels constrained by the love of God and responds in love to God; in this case the conversion is characterized by a reorganization of the emotional life around this new centre; or (c) *moral*—the confession of failure; a reorientation of the will in respect of its dominant aims for life. Of course, in all conversions there is a blending of intellectual, emotional, and volitional factors; but these tend to manifest themselves in different degrees in different individuals.

3. Dr G. A. Coe<sup>5</sup> gave four "marks" of conversion: (a) The subject's very self seems to be profoundly changed; (b) This change seems not to be wrought by the subject but upon him; the control seems not to be self-control, the outcome not a result of mere growth; (c) The sphere of the change is the attitudes that constitute one's character or mode of life. One's whole world may acquire new meaning; there may come a sense of Divine presence, or a new insight into a new doctrine or into a whole system of doctrine; (d) The change includes a sense of attaining to a higher life, or to



emancipation or enlargement of the self. Often there is victory over habits that brought self-condemnation. Now and then there is recovery from moral degradation and helplessness. These four "marks" were given by Coe in 1916: they are amply corroborated by subsequent work in the study of conversion.

### TYPES OF CONVERSION

It is usual to refer to two main types of conversion—*sudden* and *gradual*. But my own pastoral experience and specialized study have led to the conclusion that there are four or five distinguishable "types", always remembering that in the last analysis no two conversions are altogether alike and that there is a danger in too rigid a classification. The several types may be described as:

1. *Unconscious Conversion of the "Once-born" type*. By this is meant that the process of spiritual integration which characterizes religious conversion has been an unconscious process. The person has a living faith, but cannot recall any moment of decision; sometimes he is not able to remember a time when he did not believe. The conversion was a process rather than a crisis. The process of internalization has been an unconscious process. The subject has come to accept the religious ideas presented to him, and to make them his own, he knows not how. There are many in our Churches to-day of whom this is true; and their experience is as valid, and their religion is as real, as those of their fellow church-members whose "conversion" has been more spectacular. They are the "once-born" type of Christians, of whom it has been said that they have been children of God from their birth, and have never left the Father's house or wandered into the far country.<sup>6</sup> It is to be regretted that this type of conversion experience is not always recognized by those who engage in evangelistic enterprise.

2. *Gradual Conversion*, often covering a period of years. The moment of decision is but the climax of a long period of conscious and/or unconscious preparation. Looking back, the subject is able to trace the main paths by which he has been brought in his spiritual pilgrimage, and perhaps can recall a moment of decision or of surrender; but in this type of conversion the process is of greater significance than the crisis. It differs from what has been called *unconscious conversion* by the fact that the subject passes through a definite experience which is a transition from no religion, or a religion that is not vital, to a religion that is personal and vital.

The following are descriptions of their experience from living persons :

Many things led up to my conversion; many unobtrusive, often incidental, influences were at work. Together they produced in me a state of heart that was ready for the final stimulus to soul and brain that resulted in conversion. It was a gradual process. The New Man slowly emerged from the old, but not suddenly or dramatically.

My conversion was gradual—starting with formal religion. Then I started thinking about it and questioning myself. The climax came when it was made clear to me that one could not become a Christian without first being converted.

My conversion came about on very rational lines. There was nothing emotional about it but there was never any break in a positive and developing process. I knew all the time I was seeking God, and knew that I was getting nearer and nearer. The discovery of Christ seemed a very natural climax. With that I knew the goal had been reached. I wanted God primarily because life was unsatisfactory without him. Christ has never ceased to be a living reality since first I discovered him twenty years ago.

There was a gradual working up over a period of about ten years, gaining in urgency until a crisis was reached, with a complete conversion.

These responses are typical of hundreds that the writer has had in the course of research over a period of years. Their value here lies in the fact that they are spontaneous descriptions of their experiences by the subjects themselves. Over and over again the two essential characteristics are mentioned: (a) The gradual process; and (b) the eventual crisis or climax.

3. *Conversion by Stages.* This is a variant form of *gradual conversion*. From a careful sifting of data it emerged as a very definite type. The growth of the religious life is gradual, but in steps or stages that are often clearly marked. The development is characterized by a series of crises. The convert is aware of spiritual progress at each stage of the experience but at none of the stages, except the last, does he reach finality and full conscious assurance. The process is largely conscious, and, in retrospect, the convert is able to recall and to describe the ways and means whereby he was led onward in his search for God. In my own experience I have found individuals who have experienced two, three, four, and even five, stages of conversion. I have found this a valuable insight for pastoral purposes. Its significance first became apparent to me in the context of my

day-to-day parish work, when one and another told me that they had "been converted" once, or twice, or more, but that "it hadn't worked" or that they still were living in spiritual uncertainty. To give but one example:

A man in his early thirties came for spiritual counsel. He told me that he had been converted three times, but that he was still not "there" spiritually. I asked him to recall in detail the circumstances of each of his three "conversions" one by one. He told me all that he could remember of each experience. He said that at the first experience he had hoped to find peace but soon discovered that he had not fully done so. Several years later he attended an evangelistic meeting. After the meeting he sought the help of the evangelist. This evangelist told the subject that his first conversion was not valid, and outlined what he ought to do, assuring him that this would be a valid conversion. The subject went through the motions of conversion again that night, but, again, soon found that he had not experienced what he had hoped. Shortly after, he came into contact with an evangelical clergyman who told him that neither of his previous experiences had been valid, and offered to lead him into true conversion. Again he went through the motions; but still without the experience of the finality which he sought. And here he was, in my study, in a state of great spiritual perplexity. I helped him to analyse each of his so-called conversions, and we discovered that each one had been a crisis following some kind of process, and that each of the crises had taken him one step further in his spiritual pilgrimage. So that there was no need to tell him that his previous experiences were not valid conversions; each had met a particular need, and his former spiritual counsellors had been wrong in declaring his earlier experiences to be invalid, and they had not helped him by making such pronouncements.

After dealing with a number of such cases, I determined to study them more deeply, and I have come to the conclusion that they represent a definite type of religious conversion. It is possible that, from the psychological point of view, each stage represents an internalization of religious truth at a deeper level of the unconscious life. To recognize *conversion by stages* as a definite type might help many who are engaged in evangelistic and pastoral work to deal with certain individuals more realistically.

4. *Sudden Conversion*. Here the crisis is more prominent than the process; the process may have been subconscious or unconscious.

In cases of "sudden" conversion the convert can often recall the time, place, and circumstances of the experience. Sudden conversion is often a revolutionary experience changing completely long-standing habits of thought, feeling and will. In analysing the details of a "sudden" conversion the preparatory process must not be ignored. As Dr Eric S. Waterhouse<sup>7</sup> has pointed out, a literally instantaneous conversion never occurs; there is always a certain amount of preparation, even unconscious preparation, to aid the adjustment of the mind to the new idea. But often the preparatory process is not consciously recognized by the convert and is not apparent to the evangelist; hence the number of seemingly sudden conversions. Examples could be multiplied, but this type of conversion is so familiar to those engaged in pastoral and evangelistic work that there is no need to belabour the point.

5. *Conversion and Reconversion.* A study of the varieties of conversion would not be complete without reference to an experience which might be termed "secondary conversion" or "re-conversion". This is a second definite experience; it appears to become necessary in some cases of adolescent conversion, in order to confirm and/or to complete the conversion. This type of experience differs from *conversion by stages* in several important points. In conversion by stages the convert is aware of spiritual progress at each successive stage, but does not gain full assurance until the final stage has been reached. In *conversion and re-conversion* there are two distinct experiences, both real, and, at the time of their occurrence, both final, in the consciousness of the convert. The first experience of Christ is vital, deeply affecting the person's life; but at a later stage of mental, physical, and spiritual growth, a second experience becomes necessary to meet the new need.

There is a sound psychological reason for this second experience in many cases. Quite frequently those who make a response in childhood or in early adolescence (probably under ideal conditions, in the environment of a secure and religious home-life) need a confirmatory experience in later life to complete their conversion. The child who decides for Christ may make a real and sincere committal, but that committal cannot be more complete than the stage of his natural development allows; neither can he fully apprehend in childhood all that is implied in the step he takes. As he develops mentally and physically, new factors enter into his everyday life. If his religious knowledge and experience develop in pro-



portion to his mental and physical growth, then he becomes a strong and intelligent Christian. But if, as is so often the case, his religious development fails to keep pace with his growing knowledge and his physical development, then he finds himself in a state of tension between natural maturity and spiritual immaturity, and he is apt to judge religion and religious experience in the light of his childhood response. (Perhaps this is why some who profess conversion in childhood lapse in later life.) During this period of tension there may be a time of "backsliding", or, at least, of spiritual barrenness; often there is intellectual doubt. He has to decide whether to renounce the decision of childhood or to seek an adjustment between it and his fuller life. At last the final decision is made; the response of childhood is confirmed; a renewed joy is experienced; it seems almost like a second conversion.

This second experience is always very real. Quite often the phenomena of the first experience are repeated—sometimes in intensified forms. There is a sense of failure and frustration, a conviction of sin, a longing after holiness, and a fresh realization of the power of the Gospel of Christ. Doubts and problems are resolved and there comes into the soul a sense of reconciliation, release, and power. The main feature of this second experience is generally that of *surrender*, whilst *receiving* or *accepting* Christ is the characteristic feature of the first experience.

## PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES INVOLVED IN CONVERSION

1. G. A. Coe describes conversion as a step in the creation of a self—the actual coming-to-be of a self. He says that the language of the Parable of the Prodigal Son—"he came to himself"—is scientifically accurate. In conversion the pronoun "my" acquires new meaning; mere drifting, mere impulse, are checked; my conduct and attitudes attach to me more personally and consciously; I stand out in a new way, judging myself and my world, and giving loyalty of articulate purpose to the cause with which I identify myself.<sup>8</sup>

2. The element of self-reference is usually evident in the early stages of conversion. Conversion is a very personal matter, and the motives that prompt the individual to seek God are often mixed. But the desire for personal salvation springs generally from a sense of personal need. This sense of need manifests itself in various forms,



but the elements most frequently found, in the order of their frequency, are: *Fear*; *Conviction of sin*; *Dissatisfaction with one's present life*, a feeling of meaninglessness; and *A vague sense of need*, undefined, but apparently related to the feeling of meaninglessness. This finding is not surprising, for it is to such states of need that the evangelistic message is customarily addressed.

3. There is no doubt that the element of self-reference is uppermost in the majority of conversions, but in some cases *other-regarding motives* are also present. For example, *response to Divine Love*—"We love him because he first loved us"; and *a desire to serve*—i.e. gratitude to God in the form of a desire to dedicate oneself to his service. Perhaps these elements would be present in a greater number of cases if the call to dedication were included more frequently in the evangelistic appeal.

4. Dreams play a greater part in religious conversion than is sometimes realized. In the course of years, I have gathered data which indicate that in some cases of conversion a dream or dreams made a decisive contribution either in the preparatory period prior to the actual conversion, or as a confirmatory experience shortly after it. It is difficult to categorize the dreams one has studied, and a whole article could be written on them alone; but roughly, in the order of frequency, they may be categorized as: Dreams about heaven, death and judgement; Dreams in which Christ (or some other heavenly being, such as an Angel or the Blessed Virgin Mary) is the central Figure; Dreams in which personal problems are in focus; Dreams emphasizing the presence and power of evil.

The interpretation of dreams is a notoriously difficult matter; but frequently I have found that the convert is able to interpret his own dream or dreams, or with patience on the part of the counsellor he can be helped to interpret them.

5. Visions also accompany some conversions. This, again, is a subject which could well be enlarged upon; but briefly and roughly, the visions of which one has been told include, in order of frequency: Visions of the Presence of God or of Christ; Visions of the Suffering Saviour or of Christ on the Cross; Symbolic projections of personal problems; Visions of Judgement; Visions of heavenly beings, such as angels or departed Loved Ones; Visions of the presence of evil.

6. An interesting fact, and a fact of great importance from the psychological point of view, is that over and over again these

dreams and visions reflect the background and antecedent experiences of the subject himself. Thus, his dream or vision of Christ is "as he is portrayed by such-and-such an artist," or "like a picture in my first illustrated Bible". Dreams and visions can often be guides to the spiritual advisor who seeks to help those who look to him for guidance.

### FACTORS IN CONVERSION

1. In all my studies I have been impressed by the enormous influence of institutional religion in the formulation of religious attitudes in general, and in cases of conversion in particular. There is no doubt that the strongest influences leading young people to adopt a religious attitude to life are: the Christian home; Sunday School; Church attendance; and the Church Youth Group. Only after these, in spite of all the publicity that goes with them, do we find evangelistic campaigns; then come small-group methods of evangelism, open-air meetings, and other "informal" methods of evangelism, including radio broadcasts and religious films.

2. The sacramental aspect of the Church's worship must not be overlooked here. Although not intended primarily as evangelistic media, experience shows that the Sacraments and other rites of the Church are, in some cases, aids to religious conversion. Sometimes conversion coincides with participation in one or other of the Church's ceremonies; in other cases, the outward ceremony and all that is involved in public profession, confirm a newly-found faith. Adult Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion are named by subjects as the moments either of their conversion or of the confirmation of their conversion. And Sacramental Confession is also mentioned by some.

### PROBLEMS RELATING TO RELIGIOUS CONVERSION

The subject of conversion is so much before the Church at the present time that it is necessary to face certain dangers and problems inherent in evangelism. For example:

1. First, there is the problem of lapses. Years ago Dr E. S. Waterhouse<sup>9</sup> computed that not more than 20 per cent of those who professed conversion proved satisfactory. Whether more recent efforts,

such as those of Dr Billy Graham, will prove more lasting in their effects, it is too early to judge. But the problem of lapses must be faced. In connection with a recent campaign I was told that those who were preparing for it were praying that fifty per cent of the converts might stand. In anticipation of the campaign they judged that a fifty-fifty result would be satisfactory. Frankly, I was appalled. Experience has taught me that untold harm might be done to the fifty per cent who were expected to lapse. No man has the right to traffic thus in souls. The professional evangelist is always in danger of harming souls, as many an experienced pastor or parish priest can testify.

2. Then there is another temptation to which certain types of evangelists appear to be subjected. That is, the temptation to attempt to create in their hearers a sensitivity to a particular kind of need. The aim appears to be to create a sense of need and then to offer the evangel as the answer to that need. Dr William Sargant's work is a commentary on this kind of evangelism. It is a type of evangelism that ought to be resisted. The whole matter of the evangelistic approach ought to come under fresh discussion in the light of certain observable trends.

3. Thirdly, there is the danger of *undue emotionalism*. This is particularly acute in mass and group evangelism. Sometimes a decision made in a crowd or group in rather unusual circumstances is too highly emotional and is subsequently regretted. The emotional "atmosphere" of the evangelistic meeting and the persuasiveness of the preacher may lead to a "decision" which is psychologically inadequate. The decision may be made without due thought and without the full assent of the will. Something less than the whole personality is, therefore, involved in the act, and in time the decision is regretted and perhaps reversed.

4. Fourthly, there is the danger of *premature decision*. In some cases that have come under my own observation, the "convert" has been pressed to make a decision prematurely. Such a decision is never satisfactory either to the "convert" or to the Church, and it does not enhance the reputation of the evangelist. In time it is sure to have unfortunate results.

5. Finally, there is the problem in many cases of the *lack of pastoral care*. Some lapses are due to the simple fact that the converts are not "followed up". If space permitted, one could cite a number of such cases. But, again, this problem is too well-known

to need further elaboration. Dr Graham did all he could to avoid this danger.

### CONCLUSION

Much more could have been written on each of the topics touched upon in this article; but perhaps sufficient has been said to indicate the large range of subjects and the wide field of research that are still open to serious pastors and students of religious experience. The three main conclusions standing out from years of research are: (a) the influence of early upbringing on later religious life; (b) that contemporary evangelism is confined almost entirely to those who are already members of the Christian Church or who have at least been nurtured in the Faith to some extent (it has not been possible to show this here, but it is a fact); and (c) that pressing for conversions has its dangers and problems as well as its successes.

The work of the modern pastor is a delicate and sacred one. He must make a personal—sometimes an intimate—approach to others; he comes face to face with human need and distress; he is often the last human support of those in sickness, bereavement, and of those who pass through the valley of the shadow of death; he shares the confidences of those who seek his help; he hears their confessions; he grapples with their problems and their intellectual doubts. This is no task for the novice or for those with a spiritual axe to grind. It calls for wisdom and knowledge, patience and understanding, and, above all, a consecration of the whole personality—so far as that is possible—to the service and well-being of those to whom he is sent.

<sup>1</sup> Joost de Blank, *This is Conversion*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1957.

<sup>2</sup> Erik Routley, *The Gift of Conversion*, Lutterworth Press, 1957.

<sup>3</sup> William Sargant, *Battle for the Mind*, Heinemann, 1957.

<sup>4</sup> William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, Longmans, Green and Co., 1947 edition, p. 186.

<sup>5</sup> G. A. Coe, *The Psychology of Religion*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1916, p. 153.

<sup>6</sup> F. W. Newman, quoted by George Jackson in *The Fact of Conversion*, Hodder and Stoughton, 2nd Edition, 1909, p. 100.

<sup>7</sup> Eric S. Waterhouse, *Psychology and Pastoral Work*, Univ. London Press, 1939, pp. 139-140.

<sup>8</sup> p. 171.

<sup>9</sup> p. 143.

# THE ROYAL STOLE: AN INQUIRY

E. H. BURGMANN

PROFESSOR RATCLIFF in his *The Coronation Service* (Cambridge 1953), pp. 31-2, derives the Royal Stole from the Byzantine *loros*. He finds the origin of the *loros* in the *toga picta* of the consuls, and in Lewis and Short's *Latin Dictionary* we are told that this *toga picta* was "the embroidered toga worn by a triumphing commander". Ratcliff tells us that the Byzantine emperors used to wear this *loros* over the *supertunica*. It would appear probable that the "triumphing commander" was really adopting an imperial robe. Ecclesiastics did the same sort of thing. (See Woolley, *Coronation Rites* (Cambridge 1915), p. 186. In vestments "it is the episcopal which is descended from the imperial, and not vice versa".)

Schramm in *A History of the English Coronation* (Oxford 1937), p. 135, refers to the blurring of the line between the royal and sacerdotal robes. He adds: "When the Emperor Henry VI inherited the coronation treasures of the King of Sicily, he also received the *lorum* which that King had worn in imitation of the Byzantine Emperor. This *lorum* was originally a broad strip, slung round the shoulders and body, and hanging down from the left arm. It had something of the appearance of a stole, and from then onwards it was so denominated. Further, kings who wanted to rival emperors now assumed the wearing of this stole."

It is reasonable, then, to seek for the origin and meaning of the Royal Stole in the dress of the Byzantine emperor, and in this *lorum* in particular. An example of it can be found, taking us back to the tenth century, in plate 40 (see also plate 17) of Baynes and Moss, *Byzantium* (Oxford 1949). After the tenth century, illustrations are numerous and we eventually arrive at the fine stole of "The Emperor Charles V in his Coronation robes", in Woolley, p. 55. This is the form arrived at in the sixteenth century with which we are familiar.

N. H. Baynes in *Byzantium*, p.xvii, reminds us that "when he [Constantine] went to the East he came into lands where language,



literature, and thought were all alike Greek. There could be no idea of transforming the East into a Latin world."

It is also important to remember that this Greek world had been in touch with Egypt since before the days of Herodotus. Egypt was the classical world of kingship. What Rome was for law and government, and Greece for art and science, Egypt was for religion and kingship. The divine kings of Egypt lifted tribes from savagery and barbarism into national unity and the culture of civilization. The Greeks were greatly impressed by Egypt, and Alexander the Great no doubt felt that he became a proper king when he went to his coronation in the shrine of Ammon in Libya. He became the child of Zeus-Ammon and in due time the diadem, and the Ram's Horns of Ammon, a ram-god, appeared on Greek coins. A plate of coins showing how this device persisted from Alexander to Constantine appears in Richmond's Riddell Memorial Lectures on *Archaeology*. "From start to finish", says Richmond's note, "these coins reflect the type of the divinely inspired Hellenistic ruler, based upon Alexander."

Alexander was probably influenced by more places than Egypt, but a matter as interesting to the imaginative Greeks as Egyptian kingship would make a vivid impression. The Greek Ptolemies ruled in Egypt as Egyptian kings. Byzantium was noted for its conservative preservation of its past inheritance. Most of the royal regalia can be quite clearly traced back to Egypt. If there is anything in Egyptian coronation regalia that makes good sense of the *loros* then it may well be related to it. It is highly improbable that the Byzantines invented the *loros* or derived it from anything so recent as a Roman toga of any shape or form. "Triumphing commanders" copied Alexander. If they suspected him of wearing anything like a *loros* they would wear it also.

When we turn to Egyptian coronation rites we have at hand an authoritative work by Henri Frankfort on *Kingship and the Gods* (Chicago 1948). There is also his smaller book on *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (New York 1949). We shall quote mainly from the former. Frankfort, p. 44, tells us that "in relation to the king, Isis and Hathor remained distinct. When the emphasis was laid on his divinity *per se*, the king was Horus, son of Hathor." Isis was the throne occupied by the heir and successor in the royal line. It is Hathor, therefore, who is the mother of Egyptian kingship and is important for our subject. She was a Great-Mother goddess and her

worship became universal in Egypt. The cow was her sacred animal and she is pictured in the papyrus marshes suddenly parting the reeds and appearing to the original dwellers in the Nile valley (Frankfort, Figure 39). He says: "The King is primarily 'Horus', and Hathor is the mother of Horus." Her name means "the house of Horus". Papyrus was sacred to Hathor. The marshes were her home and the setting for her manifestations. "The picking of papyrus was a ceremony carried out in her honour", pp. 171, 177.

Hathor was also "the Golden One", the giver of life (p. 172).

The association of Hathor and the papyrus was close and constant. A papyrus reed is also a sceptre, because sacred to her. It formed her head-dress, see *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, figure 25. Frankfort reminds us how the ancient Nile dwellers used the papyrus for shelters and also for reed capes around the shoulders. It entered into architecture, and even stone structures took on the patterns of bundles of reeds tied together.

In a section in his *Kingship*, pp. 132-137, Frankfort tells us about a "power-charged object" which he calls "Qeni". He derives it from the reed capes made from Hathor's sacred papyrus. It is a stomacher, and the King wears it around his chest and back. Figure 32 shows us a royal priest wearing the vestment. The living King Horus is invested with this at the moment when the dead King Osiris is to be buried. Egyptian kingship included both Osiris and Horus, Osiris to rule the dead and Horus the living. This Qeni vestment is identified with Osiris, the departing king who is, of course, a god. It is charged with the virtue of undying kingship. It is the "embrace" of Horus by Osiris whereby kingship abides the passing of generations with power undiminished. The kingly virtue of Osiris passes into Horus. Frankfort adds "The 'embrace' is no mere sign of affection, but a true fusion, a communion between two living spirits, *unio mystica*."

Now Frankfort makes this the "embrace" of Horus by Osiris, but surely the original "embrace" was that of Hathor "the house (and mother) of Horus". Osiris, and in due time other gods, takes over the "embracing" function of Hathor, the Great-Mother. It is the life-giving "embrace" of the God. Frankfort points out that in due time the male gods pushed the mother goddesses into the background.

Hathor could thus "embrace" by a vestment derived from her sacred papyrus. She could also "embrace" in gold. The gods who succeeded to her function could also do the same.

Hathor's protecting on every side is seen in primitive symbolism in Frankfort's *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, figure 12. The goddess Hathor as a cow is protecting King Psammetichos who is standing like a calf before her. The king was sometimes described as the "calf of Hathor", and we need to remember the Egyptian dependence upon cattle.

The embrace of the god was also pictured as a rebirth or a resurrection to new life, to eternal life. Egyptian kings were divine and to become a king was to become divine and to share in their immortality. The thought still clings to kingship: "May the Queen live for ever."

Frankfort has a beautiful "embracing" prayer put into the mouth of the god Ptah (p. 135). "When I see thee my heart rejoices", the god says to King Ramses II, "and I receive thee in an embrace of gold, I enfold thee with permanence, stability, and satisfaction; I endow thee with health and joy of heart; I immerse thee in rejoicing, joy, and gladness of heart, and delights—for ever."

It is highly probable that this *Qeni* has come down to us in the Royal Stole. The stole has shown a strong power of survival, and the *Qeni* symbolism justifies its use both in coronation and in other rites. It signifies the embracing protection and life-giving presence of God. It recalls St Paul's phrase about "putting on Christ" (Gal. 3. 27). It is the eternal life, which was first glimpsed in ancient Egypt, that is "put on" by the putting on of Christ, the King of kings. It gives a fullness of meaning to the words, "Receive this stole for a token of the Lord's protection 'embracing' you on every side; and may you be strengthened in all your works and defended against your enemies both bodily and ghostly." All these words carry echoes through all the ages of kingship.

The words left for the Bracelets are appropriate to them: "Receive the Bracelets of sincerity and wisdom; for symbols and pledges of that bond which unites you with your peoples." The Bracelets have a distinct and ancient history and can stand by their own right. It would seem to be a great pity for them to encroach on the very important symbolism of the Royal Stole.

---

The foregoing was submitted to Professor Henri Frankfort who wrote as follows:

23 November 1953.

My dear Lord Bishop,

Thank you for your letter. I have read your script with the greatest interest, and I find that the crux of the matter whether the Loros can be connected with the *Qeni* turns on this: How much of the very elaborate Egyptian ritual of the coronation was applied to Alexander, and if we assume he went through the full ceremonial how much of this was applied to his successors and was eventually passed on to Byzantium where the Roman tradition was of course preponderant.

As far as I am aware, we know very little indeed of the actual ritual of Hellenistic kingship, and it is my impression that the thoughts associated with the *Qeni* are very peculiar and essentially Egyptian. When you say on page 3, last but one paragraph, that the "embrace" of Horus by Osiris was originally that of Hathor, you touch precisely on one of those Egyptian thoughts which are so difficult for us to grasp. The reaching of immortality through union with the mother is one thing, and the unity between Osiris and Horus a totally different one. It seems to me hard to believe that the very peculiar conception of kingship (as involving two generations at one time) could have had any meaning for either Alexander or the Ptolemies. If it did not, it is of course possible to assume that the *Qeni* was continuing to be used, since it was also used in the opening of the mouth ceremony and might therefore survive even if other parts of the Coronation ritual were shortened and simplified; but you see how hypothetical the connection is. On the other hand, I do not deny that the shape of the *Qeni* might conceivably develop into that of the Loros, but even this connection is of course not proven.

I think therefore that your suggestion is one which we may usefully bear in mind, so that we can be on the lookout for evidence which bears on the matter.

Yours very sincerely,

H. FRANKFORT

To this the writer replied:

3 April 1954.

My dear Professor Frankfort,

Very many thanks for your letter of 23/11/53 dealing with my suggestions about the possible connection of the Royal Stole

with the *Qeni*. I have not been able to get back to the subject as I had hoped to do, but I have had your advice in mind to "be on the lookout for evidence". In this connection I have become interested in the *Ephod* of the Hebrew high-priest, which was also a ritual garment of Hebrew kings and priests. It seems to have been essential for "divination". When King David wanted to know the will of Yahweh he sent for the *Ephod* (1 Sam. 23. 9) in the same way that a priest today would send for his stole for any sacramental ritual act. In an old copy of Gesenius's *Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon* (1857) the *Ephod* is described as "a garment of the high priest, worn over the tunic and robe, without sleeves, divided below the armpit in two parts, the anterior of which covered the breast and belly, the hinder covered the back; these were joined on the shoulders with clasps of gold, set with precious stones. This garment reached down to the middle of the thighs, and was bound to the body by a girdle."

This description would come reasonably close to a description of your *Qeni* on the Sem priest, plate 32, *Kingship and the Gods*.

In Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*, ed. 1952, *Ephod* is "priestly garment, shoulder-cape or mantle, etc." It is suggested that it might mean "robe of approach [to God]". "Ephod used in consulting." With all the references. S. R. Driver in his article on the *Ephod* in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1903) in a footnote (p. 725) says: "It is possible that the *Ephod* was of Egyptian origin." He goes on to quote authorities which I have no means of checking, but says they give illustrations "of divine and royal personages having similarly a richly decorated garment round the body, supported by two shoulder straps, fastened at the top by a gem, and secured round the waist by a girdle". Might not this be the *Qeni*, or derived from it?

The most exhaustive note I can find on the *Ephod* is in C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, 1918, pp. 236-43. He concludes that the *ephod* was never an idol but "the ordinary priestly vestment which was employed in obtaining an oracle".

It would appear that the *unio mystica* achieved by the putting on of the *Qeni* had a Hebrew version in the putting on of the *Ephod*. The Hebrews made subtle variations in most of the things they borrowed but somehow the *Ephod* infused them with divine spirit which enabled king or priest to learn the will of God.



If this line of thought has any validity it would give us a link between *Qeni* and Christian stole through the Jewish high priest and king. It brings us a little closer to the *Loros*, and through the *Loros* to the Royal Stole.

Unfortunately Professor Frankfort's death intervened. His authority is very great indeed, but it is conceivable that the Hathor-Horus embrace preceded the Osiris-Horus embrace at a long distance. Egypt had plenty of time. From first to last an Egyptian King needed to be married to the right Queen.

If the Royal Stole has such a venerable history it would be a great pity to allow the Bracelets to usurp its position in the Coronation Service. Bracelets do not "embrace" the King in any ritual sense. The word "embrace" is the highly significant word in this Coronation prayer. The *Lorus* definitely "embraces", as did the *Qeni*.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1948.  
 Henri Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, Columbia University Press, New York 1949.  
 N. H. Baynes and H. St L. B. Moss, *Byzantium*, Oxford 1949.  
 Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, Oxford 1937.  
 L. Woolley, *Coronation Rites*, Cambridge 1915.  
 L. G. Wickham Legg, *English Coronation Records*, Constable, Westminster 1901.  
 Dom F. A. Crasquet, *The Pall from the Body of the Blessed Peter: A Sermon*, 1892. St Anselm's Society, London.

# THE USE OF A UNIVERSITY <sup>1</sup>

NORMAN SYKES

1 Kings 19. 9. And the Lord said unto Elijah, What doest thou here?  
Psalm 32. 8 Thou hast set my feet in a large room.

THE pregnant question addressed by the Lord to Elijah at the cave near Horeb is one which with equal pertinence and propriety each one of us may ask himself as a member of a University at the beginning of a new academic year: *What doest thou here?* For though a university education is no longer the monopoly of what used to be called "the privileged classes", it remains still the privilege of only a minority of our fellow-citizens; and to those of us fortunate to enjoy it, it is a high responsibility. We may therefore justly ask ourselves, What is our purpose in entering upon the noble prerogative of academic life, and what use do we intend to make of its splendid opportunities? *What doest thou here?* No doubt the first answer likely to occur to our mind is that we desire by the acquisition of a university degree to fit ourselves to earn a livelihood in the highly specialized and competitive society into which we have been born. Nor is there anything unworthy or unbecoming in this reason. In the traditional words of the Bidding Prayer which has just been read, the universities have as their *raison d'être* the provision of "a succession of fit persons duly qualified for the service of God in Church and State"; and by our presence here we acknowledge that we aspire to be worthy of that academic succession. Whatever the field of our study, it has this immediate practical relevance. Indeed a seventeenth century English archbishop, in defending his thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, affirmed of his own subject that "though the end of theology is to gain souls, the end of the theologian, subordinate to the first and architectonical end, is for an honest maintenance and sustentation". It is only if the ambition to equip ourselves for the service of God in our own particular profession by

<sup>1</sup> A Sermon preached before the University of Exeter in the Cathedral Church of St Peter on 13 September 1957.

the obtaining of a degree, should become the sole and exclusive end and aim of our education here, that it is reprehensible and mistaken.

For it is the peculiar province and glory of residence in a university to set our feet in a large room. Whatever the special field of our interest, it should possess that magic property of a talisman to say "Open, Sesame" to

a world of wonders

So rich in toys and playthings, that naked Nature

Were enough without the marvellous inventory of Man.

These words of Robert Bridges express indeed as lucidly as succinctly the particular *differentia* of a university. If I may speak for a moment of my own especial subject, that of the study of history, borrowing the moving words of a former Cambridge historian and divine, J. N. Figgis, our Alma Mater offers to us "the power to live and not merely to drudge; to form our plans and win high delights; at our feet she pours the treasured memories of the ages; she opens the long corridors of history and the palaces of all the courts; to us she permits to rest by pleasant streams, and grants the glory of letters and the fellowship of men gone by". Nor do I doubt that in divers portions and varying ways this is true of all other academic disciplines, alike scientific and humanistic. Whatever our individual field of study, education in a university should evoke in us, as in Tennyson's *Ulysses*,

a yearning in desire

To follow knowledge like a sinking star

Beyond the utmost bounds of human thought.

But there is another, and even deeper, relevance to our present condition in the challenge to Elijah. Why does this University assemble in this cathedral church to inaugurate its new academic session? And what is the purport of our individual attendance? What mean we by this service? Is it but a formal compliment to the physical juxtaposition in this historic city of an ancient cathedral and a new university? Or is it a prescient and profound perception of their indissoluble unity of aim and purpose? Once again the answer is expressed in the phrase of the Bidding Prayer which speaks of the union of true religion and sound learning. For it is the solemn responsibility of the Christian tradition to take the talent entrusted to it, through the historical revelation in the Old and New Testaments, and to trade it amid the manifold learning of

each successive age and generation. Its treasure is not to be hidden away from contact and commerce with other branches of study, like the talent wrapped in a napkin and buried in a field; but it must needs be reminted and remoulded in close and intimate correspondence with the secular condition of each century.

For ourselves this means that profession of Christianity is no barrier to the pursuit of whatever subject of secular study is to engage our attention here. It was none other than Charles Simeon, the great Evangelical leader in Cambridge, who exhorted the undergraduates of his day that "College is the place for study . . . If my coachman neglected my horses, or my cook my dinner, that they might read the Bible, they would be displeasing and dishonouring their God. So, if students neglect their duties of the place for the sake of reading their Bibles, they are not in the path of duty . . . Remember, secular study, as appointed by the authorities, is here your duty to God." Evidently this advice could only be given from the assured conviction that Christianity is indissolubly concerned in all forms of human culture and investigation; so that all knowledge, whether wrested from the rocks of the earth or inherited from the words of the sages of the classical era, is part of that manifold wisdom of God revealed throughout all the ages. It is integral to the unity of true religion and sound learning, that whilst our feet should "walk the studious cloister's pale" of our University buildings, no less should our attendance in this cathedral testify to our love of

The high, embowèd roof  
And storied windows, richly dight,

and of

Its service high and anthems clear  
As may with sweetness through mine ear  
dissolve me into ecstasies  
And bring all heaven before mine eyes.

Of course it is also true, and this truth is an integral part of Christian belief and practice, that to excel in academic study requires a rigid, constant, and watchful discipline both of mind and body. If we are to profit fully from the opportunities of education here, we shall need in due measure "to scorn delights and live laborious days"; for in this, as in all kinds of human activity, whether athletic or intellectual or spiritual, the way to perfection is one of self-control, self-denial, and sacrifice. No society moreover

is better fitted to teach us these several truths than that of a residential university.

But the unity of true religion and sound learning has more than an individual application. History bears abundant testimony to the fidelity of the Church in discharging the trust of trading its talent amid the varying cultures of the world. From the ancient schools of Christian philosophy at Antioch and Alexandria to the African cities of Carthage and Hippo whence came the literary works of Cyprian and Augustine; from the Benedictine houses in western Europe, which preserved in monastic schools and *scriptoria* the learning of the classical world savoured with the salt of Christian otherworldliness, to the cathedral schools from which sprang the medieval universities and the fine flowering of the scholastic theology, which sought to resume the work of Alexandria by re-baptizing Aristotle into Christ; from the revived zeal for education kindled by the Renaissance and fostered alike by the leaders of the Reformation and of the Counter-Reformation to the ubiquitous foundation of overseas colleges and schools as a result of the phenomenal missionary expansion of Christianity during the nineteenth century—all this is a record of a lamp, not hidden under a bushel but set aloft on a candlestick, so that nations might come to its light and kings to the brightness of its rising. Moreover, it is but a fragment of the sober witness of history; and its recital springs from no spirit of professional antiquarianism but rather from its immediate, practical relevance to our presence here to-day.

For most of the civic universities of our own country have arisen in large industrial towns, directed to serve the particular needs of those branches of technology dominant in their region, and generally remote from the ecclesiastical centres of England. Consequently the Church of England has lacked both the personnel and resources to enter fully into their academic life and studies. Here in Exeter, however, in this newly-chartered University, fortunately possessed of extensive residential facilities, and set down near to the precincts of a venerable and historic cathedral, it is surely proper and pertinent to hope for the establishment of a vigorous and distinguished Faculty of Theology, functioning in close and harmonious co-operation with the cathedral chapter. A sufficient example and precedent exist in the magnificent northern foundation at Durham, where the Dean and Chapter were not only the first founders, but continue still active participators in both the teaching



and administration of the University. May it not be thought that here likewise the Church enjoys an equal obligation and opportunity to make its own proper contribution towards the growth of a Theological Faculty? From the standpoint of the education of its official ministry, the study of theology is assuredly best undertaken in a university, side by side with other disciplines; whether the sciences whose progress increases knowledge of the vast stage on which the drama of the Christian revelation is set; or the humanistic studies of letters, history, and languages, upon whose results it is ineluctably dependent and from which so large a part of its own materials and tools are drawn.

But from the standpoint of the University also, the integration of theology with its other faculties is necessary to its own good estate and to the fullness of its heritage. "I would have the world to be thus told", remarked Dr Samuel Johnson of universities: "Here is a school where everything may be learnt." Without the support of true religion, even sound learning lacks somewhat of security and savour. Does this seem an absurd, or at least an anachronistic, claim in this heyday of scientific discovery and expanding knowledge? Granted perhaps that in past ages the humanities developed in close and harmonious alliance with theology, what can the erstwhile Queen of Sciences have to do with modern academic disciplines, especially those of the natural and applied sciences? To this it must be replied, as firmly as frankly, that a university has to do with the training of individual human personality; and that education was made for man, not man for education: It must needs confront, therefore, the ultimate issues of the nature and destiny of mankind; and if our education here fails either to face, or to provide materials for an answer to, these saecular questions, it will have profited us but little. For we know that Man is a leaseholder only, not a freeholder, on his little planet; and that, even if we set aside the sombre possibility that he may contrive the total destruction of his temporal home by the very magnitude of his scientific discoveries, yet his tenure of this globe is transient and transitory. In this context the question *What doest thou here?* is addressed to each one of us with deeper and more penetrating poignancy. What solution, we are therefore justified in asking, is afforded by scientific humanism to this most fundamental issue?

Perhaps an answer may be essayed in the words of two great humanists of the Victorian age. In a passage of haunting and

melancholy pathos, in the Epilogue to the first edition of *The Renaissance*, Walter Pater wrote: "Every moment some form grows perfect in hand or face; some tone on the hills or the sea is choicer than the rest; some mood or passion, or insight or intellectual excitement is irresistibly real and attractive to us—for that moment only. Not the fruit of experience, but experience itself is the end . . . While all melts under our feet, we may well catch at any exquisite passion, or any contribution to knowledge that seems by a lifted horizon to set the spirit free for a moment, or any stirring of the senses, strange dyes, strange colours and curious odours, or the work of the artist's hands or the face of one's friend. Not to discriminate every moment some passionate attitude in those about us, and in the brilliancy of their gifts some tragic dividing of forces on their ways, is, in this short day of frost and sun, to sleep before evening." Such is the pessimistic yet authentic testimony of humanism without faith; so sombrely moving that perhaps we may understand why this passage was omitted from the second edition, in the words of the author, "as I conceived it might possibly mislead some of those young men into whose hands it might fall".

Or, if we turn from this desperate striving of the individual to press the maximum number of sensations into a fleeting minimum of time, to the witness of the social conscience of mankind, the *Autobiography* of John Stuart Mill contains a confession of equal gravity and importance. "Suppose", he asked himself, "that all your objectives in life were realized, that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to, could be completely effected at this very instant, would this be a great joy and happiness to you? And an irrepressible self-consciousness answered, NO. At this my heart sank within me; the whole foundation on which my life was constructed fell down." Here in this frank and revealing self-examination is further evidence of the inadequacy of "the worldly hope men set their hearts upon" to satisfy the deepest needs of the individual soul.

For the question *What doest thou here?* must press with insistent and iterated urgency upon each one of us as individuals. It is not only of fundamental relevance for the interpretation of our academic studies, but also of vital import for the orientation of our life. Towards the end of his autobiographical *Recollections*, John Morley records how on a summer Sunday afternoon he took his favourite walk to the top of Hindhead; where stood "the four-

square cross set up by a judge of name and weight in his day, with the deep words carved on its four strong faces: *Post Tenebras, Lux; In Luce, Spes; In Obitu, Pax; Post Obitum, Salus*. Be thought me. commented Morley, "not for the first time, of the tomb of the Cardinal in the Capuchin church at Rome, *Pulvis et Umbra et Nihil*. Our English judge, I think, has the better music, and, as most will say, he has too the better sense." To which of these epitaphs do we subscribe? That is the question, to the answering of which the whole course and tenour of our education in this place must be aimed. For when

The cloud capp'd towers the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve  
And like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a wrack behind,

what epilogue shall be pronounced upon the epic drama of human history? Shall we repeat the verdict of humanism without faith, upon Man, and

Ask for this great deliverer now, and find him  
Eyeless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves,  
Himself in bonds under Philistian yoke;

Or shall we affirm with the Christian tradition, of which this cathedral is a sermon in stone and a continuing witness, that the immortal destiny of Man is to come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, and to the spirits of just men made perfect? Only if we hold fast firmly and stedfastly to the union of true religion with sound learning, may we give to the question *What doest thou here?* the confident and triumphant answer, *Thou hast set my feet in a large room*.

## CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,—In his article on “The New Testament and the Lord’s Ascension” (C.Q.R., Vol. CLVIII, pp. 452 ff.) Fr Mann attempts to dispose of the traditional conception of our Lord’s Ascension as an historical “event”. I believe that in his desire to prove his point he has been a little too anxious to find allies in the Evangelists. I would draw attention to the following points:

1. The author suggests that there is no certainty that Mark 16. 19, 20 refers to “an Ascension event”, that it might be “no more than a rounding off of the Incarnation-narrative, an assertion that after the familiar converse with him in the days of his flesh, men would henceforth know him in that fashion no more” (p. 456). But the Greek *anelempthe eis ton ouranon*, and it would be difficult to make *anelempthe* mean anything other than “was taken up”. Wescott and Hort, indeed, assume that these words are a quotation of 2 Kings 2. 11, (the story of Elijah’s assumption into heaven).

2. “Even in Luke 24. 52”, says Fr Mann, “. . . there is no ground, on the strictest basis of the language, to suppose that men saw Jesus leave earth and enter heaven”. The words at issue here are *anephereto eis ton ouranon*. Admittedly *anephereto* may not imply elevation; but what of *eis ton ouranon*? It could hardly mean “into the cloud”, since no cloud has been mentioned previously, and even if it could it would involve an “event” between the Resurrection and the Heavenly Session which Fr Mann is so anxious to avoid. Moreover, *ouranos* (in the singular) seems consistently to mean “heaven” rather than “cloud” in the New Testament. *Nephele* is the usual word for “cloud”. It is *nephele* that is used in the narratives of the Transfiguration. Fr Mann quotes Dr Davies’s suggestion that at the Transfiguration Jesus enters into the cloud of the divine glory as a prefiguration of the time when he will enter into it and remain in it. Is this the significance of *nephele* and *ouranos*?—the “cloud” being an occasional part of “the heavens”, and Jesus in his Ascension received into the “cloud” and carried up to dwell in “the heavens”.

But Fr Mann would object that this is to read more into Luke’s account than is intended; that Luke does not, in fact, say that the Lord ascended into heaven. Yet it is upon “heaven” (*ouranos*) that the Apostles *fix their gaze* (*atenizontes*) when the Lord is taken out of their sight. To translate “They went on looking up (i.e. not knowing where to look), while all the time he was being removed from them” (as Fr Mann does), looks very like “special pleading”. *Atenizontes* implies that they fixed their gaze in one direction; is this consistent with their “not knowing where to look”? And surely *eis ton ouranon* means more than simply “up”.

I must also confess considerable difficulty in picturing the Apostles looking for a Lord from heaven at the same time as Jesus is taken from them in the cloud.

3. Finally, the words of Mark 14. 62, "I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (again marked by Westcott and Hort as a quotation), unmistakably refer, like all similar passages of the New Testament, to a quite physical concept of heaven as existing *above* the earth; "to come with the clouds of heaven" must imply a previous ascension into the clouds of heaven.

Admittedly the Ascension is an extremely difficult concept for the twentieth century; and admittedly it is difficult to reconcile John 20. 17 and 27 with the Marcan and the Lucan accounts of the Ascension. But these difficulties must not blind us to the fact that it is impossible to explain away the physical Ascension of our Lord into "heaven" which both Luke and the spurious ending of Mark imply.

G. F. DOWDEN

Great Paxton,  
Huntingdon.



## REVIEWS

### ESCHATOLOGY

JESUS AND HIS COMING: THE EMERGENCE OF A DOCTRINE. By JOHN A. T. ROBINSON. S.C.M. Press. 15s.

THIS book is an important investigation of the origin of belief in the second coming of Christ, partly, though not mainly, because it is an *investigation* and not the defence of a thesis—at least not until its determining conclusion has been fairly reasonably established. This is that the idea of an imminent second coming of Christ on the clouds of heaven to judge the world and wind up its then and present existence does not rightly derive from the teaching of Jesus.

There is nothing new in this position. Not all theologians were captivated by Schweitzer's "thorough-going eschatology" as the key to the understanding of the Synoptic gospels. His *tour de force* largely depended upon an arbitrary selection and combination of passages in Mark and Matthew, and an almost total neglect of Luke. But Dr Robinson's supporting citations are from more recent rather than from earlier studies. His exiguous list of works "from an earlier date" given on p. 13 mentions E. von Dobschutz' *The Eschatology of the Gospels*, but no use is made of it; while Streeter's appendix in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, and his Section III in *The Lord of Thought* are apparently overlooked, though all are relevant. His own study is the weightier for being thus independent, but it is unfair to write that earlier Liberal theologians "took for granted the separation of apocalyptic from the milk" of the Gospel. They offered justification for regarding the apocalyptic as a later introduction, though on broader and less detailed evidence than Dr Robinson does. Any comparison of the material common to Matthew and Luke and that peculiar to Luke, with Mark and then Matthew, shows a regular tendency to heighten and to introduce apocalyptic eschatology; and it is the more significant in that Luke, alike in his use of Mark and of probable sources in early Acts, does not eliminate it where he found it in these sources.

Having ably and largely successfully established his main conclusion, Dr Robinson goes on to meet the most obvious challenge to it, namely, that St Paul, who had contacts with the original disciples, preached a future coming of Christ in apocalyptic-eschatological language to the Thessalonians within 20 years of the crucifixion. "We are left with a gulf fixed . . . nothing is more certain than that the transition was made", says Dr Robinson. He is here, I think, overconfident. The alleged gulf or transition depends upon an assumption

that the relevant sayings of Jesus were at some earlier time *understood* in what Dr Robinson expounds as their true meaning. From this point onwards, except in his dealing with the teaching of the fourth Gospel, I find him less persuasive. Being in agreement with his basic conclusion, I indicate summarily the grounds of hesitation about the book.

(a) It is probable that before A.D. 50 there were written documents later incorporated in the Gospels; but it is not *certain*—even that Q or Luke's peculiar matter was written earlier than Mark. Once Jesus was confessed as Messiah, risen and ascended, if not before, the probability is (whatever he himself said) that the interpretation of the title would have varied. Acts 1 represents the disciples as still wondering whether he would immediately restore the kingdom to Israel; others would just as naturally interpret the resurrection and ascension as the prelude to his coming again, in the language of apocalyptic eschatology. Whatever Jesus said and meant, early Christians hoped for his speedy return in glory and, rightly or wrongly, believed that they had his authority for their hope: otherwise, why was its disappointment so serious a problem as it manifestly was?

(b) Part of the excellence of Dr Robinson's study is his careful examination of particular phrases. But here, as in his earlier first-rate booklet *The Body* (No. 5 in *Studies in Biblical Theology*), I think he sometimes over-calls a good hand. Often the wider Christian context of words and phrases is more important for their meaning than their earlier history and usage, illuminating though that may be. Again, the importance he attaches to the fact that only in Hebrews is there an explicit reference to a *second* coming of Christ seems to me exaggerated. All Christians knew that Jesus had come, had been crucified, was risen and ascended: it follows that any reference to his "coming" *which is not plainly a backward reference or a reference to his abiding spiritual presence* so clearly implies a second coming as to render description of it as "second" wholly superfluous.

(c) The significance attached to the *ap' arti* in Matt. 26. 64 (amounting to a suggestion that it may have been deliberately suppressed in Mark 14. 62) is both uncertain and excessive. Apart from the uncertainty which must needs attach to precise words of Jesus when only enemies were present, the *opsesthe* naturally refers to the future—it is correctly absent after Luke's *apo tou nun*—a phrase characteristic of Luke, and Matthew elsewhere uses *ap' arti* and it is unnatural to interpret *ap' arti opsesthe* as meaning that *apo tou nun* the high priest would see Jesus "coming on the clouds of heaven" at the resurrection. The passage as a whole seems a clear reference (by Matthew if not by Jesus) to a future Parousia rather than to the resurrection.

(d) The weakest point in Dr Robinson's argument is the difference he sees between Acts 3. 13-15, 17-26 and Acts 2. He recognizes that "it cannot be more than a hypothesis." For the reasons given above, I think it an unnecessary one; to which may now be added that the possible sources used in these chapters cannot be distinguished with even probable reliability. Not only is any such attempt speculative, but

nothing is more dangerous than attempts to assign relative priority to hypothetical sources solely on the ground of inconsistent ideas in them. The Acts 3 passage can without violence be interpreted as referring to a future Parousia of the One already "glorified" by the resurrection and ascension. There is no explicit statement that Christ is to *return*, for the sufficient reason that heaven has already received him, and so "that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus," naturally means a second coming of Jesus who is the Christ.

It is very relevant to remember that the religious mind is rather peculiarly liable to entertain inconsistency and even contradiction than to be free from doing so—certainly in apocalyptic eschatological imagery in which there is no attempt at consistency, and in days of initial and great "enthusiasm" when there had been little time, even if there were inclination, to think things out carefully. In the early Church, as later, and certainly to-day, impracticable theory was in fact modified by indispensable habit—normal and pressing requirements of life were not cancelled by belief in an imminent Parousia and, if they were, required and received correction. These facts afford one reason why *theology* is essential, and forgetfulness of them is at the root of much confident dogmatizing about the thought of the early Apostolic age. For the same reason no *one* consistent theology is derivable from the New Testament (as the long history of doctrinal controversy demonstrates) unless either we exercise license to excise passages on no textual warrant or else indulge artificial exegetical expedients.

In conclusion, it may be suggested that the combination of the "already" with the "not yet" in the New Testament is explained even more simply than in Dr Robinson's exposition. In whatever imagery the "kingdom" or rule or realm of God is conceived, its inner and essential meaning is always a state of being in which the will of God is accepted and actualized. In so far as it is accepted and actualized, we have the "already"; but it is plainly and only partially accepted and actualized, and is therefore necessarily "not yet". Mystification and confusion could be avoided if theologians who are still influenced by the great impression Schweitzer made, but who have changed his strict and proper meaning of eschatology, would cease to use that word and its adjective for the mission, passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus as the final Divine revelation, and for the Church on earth, and reserve them for "the last things"—death, the final judgement, heaven, hell, and the climax of the Divine purposes in creation. It is unreal and an abuse of language to talk of the *eschatos* as having already happened some 2,000 years ago and when, as there is ample reason to believe, further thousands of years will pass before the final consummation, if there is to be one. Dr Robinson is temperate in saying that "realized eschatology" is perhaps not "the most felicitous expression" to use of the ministry of Jesus; and while "proleptic" or "inaugurated eschatology" (though mainly indicating determination to use the word) might pass as having some meaning, his own preferred phrase "a fully inaugurated eschatology" can only confound confusion. "Fully" and "inaugurated"

well-nigh exclude each other. Perhaps someone will describe the doctrine of original creation as "a *partially inaugurated* eschatology", and so complete the evacuation of the word of its meaning.

J. S. BEZZANT

WHEN CHRIST COMES AND COMES AGAIN. By T. F. TORRANCE. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

THE only similarity between this book and Dr Robinson's is in their titles. That is both natural and strange: natural because Professor Torrance here appears as preacher and as presenting material that should be preached, and strange because the subject of the first four of these sermons is "The Advent of the Redeemer". There are three other groups of four on other themes. What was preached has been rewritten for publication "in order to bring out more fully the content of evangelism".

Unlike some of his explicit theological writing, deeply coloured and sometimes obscured as it is by adopting Barthian phraseology, the language and style of these sermons are extremely lucid, direct, and simple. Sermons reduced to print are seldom impressive, but these are; and those who would be disposed to put question marks on three-fourths of these pages might be inhibited from doing so by their sincerity and, of course, by the recognition of much that is good, true, and wise. One knows that what the preacher cares about is not the acceptance of his his own words but what he desires that another Word may do through and by means of them.

But that said, it must be added that from start to finish the whole critical study of the Bible is ignored. The book could have been written by one who had never heard of it or by a Fundamentalist of the near literalist type. For example, a section of one sermon is headed "We must be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us", and all that is said about it is this:

Let us turn our mind and heart to the Cross of Christ and let it tell us all that God has done for us and for mankind. It is the Cross that tells us finally what Christ has done and what He has perfectly accomplished on our behalf in complete triumph over the powers of darkness and sin and death and hell and wrath and destruction. Let us learn the meaning of the atonement, learn to carry the Word of the Cross about in our heart and be ready at all times to utter it in the ears of our fellows. We must be ready to point others to the Crucified Lord that others too may find in Him their Saviour and share with us in the inheritance of hope in Him.

That may indeed be the hope in us, but is it in any sense *a reason for the hope*?



Whether in these days this type of preaching will be the means of winning more present converts than manufacturing future sceptics one cannot say; but some heed should be paid to the fact that not a few who are thus gathered into the first category are thereby assisted on their passage into the second.

J. S. BEZZANT

## THE LITTLE APOCALYPSE

A COMMENTARY ON MARK THIRTEEN. By G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY. Macmillan. 18s.

THE chief interest of present-day students of the Gospels tends to lie in the direction of the purpose with which the evangelists assembled their material and composed their portraits of Christ. Our attention has been principally directed towards a deeper understanding of the theological patterns of thought which may be discovered in the evangelists' selection and arrangement of their documentary and oral sources. Much progress has been made along these lines, especially in determining the peculiar characteristics of St Mark's theology; but one section of his Gospel presents such special difficulty that many commentators have failed to relate it to St Mark's work as a whole and have regarded it as a piece of extraneous matter. Mark Thirteen is certainly the most difficult chapter in the Synoptic Gospels.

Mr Beasley-Murray has done well to devote an entire book to a detailed critical study of this one chapter. Lightfoot and Farrer have done much to help us to realize that it is an integral part of the Gospel, not to be detached from its context; but much remains to be done if its interpretation is to be clarified. The present book makes much progress in this task. It begins with a general review of the question of the authenticity of the discourse, with a fairly full consideration of the many different theories which have been propounded concerning its unity, and the extent to which Christian and Jewish apocalyptic material may have been combined in it. Without committing himself to a definite answer to the question of the unity of the discourse, the author believes it probable that Jesus delivered teaching about the future on the Mount of Olives shortly before his death, and, in view of the marked difference between this discourse and apocalyptic, properly so called, considers it likely that "it is a new building on an original foundation", essentially the work of Jesus himself.

This view is supported by a closely-reasoned analysis of the chapter, verse by verse. This is for the most part very well documented, and the many points of controversy are examined fairly and lucidly. One might expect Manson's interpretation of *ego eimi* to have received more



attention, and throughout the book there is a curious lack of any reference to Lightfoot's treatment of the discourse in *The Gospel Message of St Mark*. Many points, however, are ably expounded. The author rightly refuses to link the wars, famines, and earthquakes with particular events. They belong rather to the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament. Against Kilpatrick, he holds that verses 9 and 10 indicate a mission to the Gentiles. A specially valuable discussion of the "abomination of desolation" leads to the conclusion that Jesus is here prophesying the occupation of Jerusalem by Roman troops and the setting up of idolatrous standards in or around the Temple, St Luke's interpretation of the phrase thus being approximately correct. There is also a careful and sensible exposition of the saying concerning the Son's ignorance of the day and the hour, claiming it to be an integral and authentic part of the discourse.

G. W. H. LAMPE

### THE SPIRIT-BRIDGE

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND ESCHATOLOGY IN PAUL. By NEIL Q. HAMILTON.  
Oliver and Boyd. 8s. 6d.

THIS is the sixth of the Occasional Papers issued under the auspices of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, and is a noteworthy contribution to the discussion of its chosen subject. It argues that Paul's christology was the source of his doctrine of the Spirit, that the power of the Spirit was shown in the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, and that it is to be further displayed in the general resurrection, to which his present activity is merely preliminary. Since they were led to perceive in themselves the presence of the Christ-Spirit who thus bridged the gap between two worlds, the early Christians were the less dismayed when they found the expected return of Christ in glory delayed. They recognized that they were already living in the new age, and learnt to await its consummation with patience.

For the Christian to-day the tension is still that between "the already present and the not-yet fulfilled". Nevertheless he has even now the first-fruits, the down payment, of the Spirit in his heart; and that gives him courage and strength to endeavour to live the ethical life that is characteristic of the Kingdom of Christ.

That seems good Pauline theology and a comforting message for the practical life of every day.

W.W.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By R. H. PFEIFFER. A. and C. Black. 20s.

IN 1952 there was published an English edition of Professor Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament*. This book, which was already widely known in its American edition, was enthusiastically received and deservedly praised as the most up-to-date work of its kind in English: a great fund of knowledge and a monumental record of critical opinions, which immediately established itself as an indispensable textbook for every student of the Old Testament. Professor Pfeiffer's latest work, *The Books of the Old Testament*, is a popular, greatly abridged and simplified version of his *Introduction*. In his foreword to the new book, the author states quite clearly its purpose: "This book is a brief and inadequate summary of my 'Introduction to the Old Testament'; it adds nothing, changes no conclusions, and omits much, namely, discussions of various opinions, citation of scholarly works and of Biblical passages, lists of editorial notes and other interpolations in the Biblical books, a chapter on the Hebrew text and ancient versions of the Old Testament, and, last but not least, such words as 'apparently, presumably, probably, possibly' which would indicate that the conclusions of this author (the best ones available!) are less reliable than the multiplication table". The extent of this abridgement can be estimated by a simple comparison of the two works. While the *Introduction* contains over 900 pages, the simplified version has only 335. As in the *Introduction*, so in the simplified version, the Old Testament is dealt with book by book, except that the Pentateuch is first analysed into documentary sources and then each source is considered separately. An indication of the type of reader whom Professor Pfeiffer has in mind, is that while the *Introduction* follows the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible, *The Books of the Old Testament* follows the order of the English Bible.

This new work is certainly a useful summary of Professor Pfeiffer's approach to and judgement upon the critical problems of the Old Testament. Yet surely, that is not quite what a reader of such a book either requires or ought to receive. The student will be seeking a discussion of the critical problems of the Old Testament, together with the various solutions that have been offered and some valuation of their relative merits and difficulties. Thus, without the references to and citations of authorities, which were such an important feature of the original, a bald statement of Professor Pfeiffer's views loses most of its value. Indeed, the very brevity of the book gives to the opinions expressed an arbitrariness that can be misleading, as, for example, that the S Document in the Pentateuch is as firmly established and widely accepted as the J and E Documents.

In all but a few cases, however, the critical positions set forth in this book are those shared by the great majority of Old Testament scholars, and the reader can feel certain that he is in very good company. But it

is true that in recent years there have been powerful attacks on many critical positions which the older generation of scholars had come to regard as axiomatic. The Scandinavians have challenged radically the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch which Professor Pfeiffer commends without question. Again, on a later page, he states that the vast majority of the Psalms were written between 400 and 100 B.C. and doubts whether any at all are pre-exilic. This is an opinion that can no longer be regarded as an established, unquestioned, result of modern criticism.

What all this amounts to is that in the present state of Old Testament studies, there can not be that unquestioning confidence in the generally accepted answers to critical problems that this book seem to imply. Professor Pfeiffer's opinions are always worthy of respect, but they are not the certainties that this book might suggest. Therefore, for anyone who is interested in the background of the books of the Old Testament and the critical problems connected therewith, it is the *Introduction to the Old Testament* and not *The Books of the Old Testament* that is required.

J. ROBINSON

## THE TEMPTATIONS

STONES OR BREAD? By GERALD VANN, O.P., and P. K. MEAGHER, O.P. Collins. 12s. 6d.

AS A theme for meditation the three temptations of our Lord have been largely neglected by spiritual writers, and the authors of this book have been encouraged to supply the deficiency. It should be said at once that they have succeeded admirably in their task; indeed, one's only regret is that they did not address themselves to the whole subject of our Lord's temptations. It is only on p. 60, halfway through the book, that the subject *Stones or Bread* is reached, and the preliminaries are proportionately a little drawn out. (The inveterate higher critic cannot help speculating which is V and which is M, and whether there was not an Ur-treatise which started at p. 60.)

The introduction rather unfortunately focusses the reader's attention on belief in the devil, and makes the rash statement that it is a short step from disbelief in the devil to disbelief in the reality of moral evil. But the value of the book is scarcely diminished for anyone who is sceptical of a personal devil. (But let him, and the authors, weigh the words of Dr Lowther Clarke: "Modern books of psychoanalysis use an invented mythology of repression below the threshold, the censor, etc.—why should this be regarded as scientific and traditional demonology absurd?"—*Concise Bible Commentary*, p. 192.) Preference is given for the view that the temptations were all internal to our Saviour's mind; there is a useful discussion of the psychology of temptation with reference to the

perfect humanity of Christ. The discussion of Satan's psychology which follows is less convincing (the Greek word for *devil* traps the printers twice on p. 33).

Specially to be commended is the distinction between trying to be perfect and being a perfectionist. "Trying to be perfect means trying to make the best possible use of the gifts, natural and supernatural, which God has given us; and that in turn means being aware of, and accepting, our physical, psychological and spiritual limitations. Being a perfectionist means fretting at those limitations, refusing to accept them, eating one's heart out because one cannot be something which is in fact out of one's range" (p. 41). There is another unforgettable distinction on p. 87: "If the occupational disease of modern communism is brainwashing, the occupational disease of some modern catholics is whitewashing." It is salutary to be reminded of St Thomas Aquinas' suggestion that a mood of sadness is to be cured by sleep and a good, hot bath (p. 108).

The Anglican reader rejoices to find quotations from Lancelot Andrewes and William Law, as also from Dostoievski, and he will apply to his own environment the strictures on the *devote* immortalized by Mauriac. Anglicans also need the warning that there are six other deadly sins. The two Dominican fathers have a certain disdain for the *profanum vulgus* that reads the popular religious weeklies, but their book is a useful corrective to the all too sound opinions which are voiced by the right people. The Anglican is not likely to be convinced by the exegesis of the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (p. 82), but will note with interest the reference to spiritual healing through the laying on of hands on p. 72. One hopes that Protestant fundamentalists will read this book and rejoice in the spiritual insight into the Scriptures on the part of men whom they are accustomed to think of as being poles removed from them. It is something of an answer to our daily prayer that we may agree in the truth of God's holy Word.

KENNETH N. ROSS

## FORMATION PERIOD

THE EXILIC AGE. By C. F. WHITLEY. Longmans. 16s.

ALL history, as has been frequently stated, can be divided into one of two periods: either a period of stability which is often long in duration but relatively empty of significant events, or a period of change, when, in a very few years, the face of the world is altered. Empires rise and fall. The ways of thought and mental presuppositions of generations are challenged and revolutionized. No institution, dogma, or cherished belief is accepted at its face value. Everything must be exposed to the refining fires of the revolution, and out of this process a new way of life emerges as the basis for a new period of stability. We are not infrequently told



to-day that we are living in just such a period of change, and we are exhorted to endure and even to welcome the troubles and vicissitudes of our time as the birthpangs of a new age.

This should give us all the more interest in Dr Whitley's subject, because the sixth century B.C. was also just such a period. The ancient empires and civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia had outlived their usefulness and were replaced by the Persian empire. Semitic ideas with their mythological ways of thought could not contain or satisfy the new Indo-Aryan spirit of intellectual inquiry, and so were replaced by the beginnings of modern science and philosophy. The old order had to perish, because the systems of both Egypt and Babylonia had become rigid societies in which any individual independence was impossible. The energies and interests of the leaders of these societies were deliberately turned to the past. Both in Egypt and in Mesopotamia evidence has been found of conscious archaizing, and to this Nabonidus' well-known interest in archaeology is to be ascribed. In sharp contrast with all this is the great stress on personal freedom in the teachings both of Zarathustra in Persia and of Buddha in India, with which must be linked the spirit of free intellectual inquiry developing among the Greeks. All was prepared for a brief, cataclysmic period when the established order that had existed for centuries, was swept away and a new order took its place.

All this is set out for us in *The Exilic Age*. As the title shows, Dr Whitley is concerned with the history of Israel in the sixth century B.C. But at such a time that history cannot be truly recounted or evaluated except within the context within which it was set. So only after the international scene has been depicted is the history of Judah recounted. The work of Josiah and the deuteronomic reformation is explained as a part of that archaizing which was typical of the age. After a general survey, Dr Whitley examines in particular the work of the three great prophets of the time, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, and shows how they link the old age with the new by stressing individual communion with God and individual responsibility before him. The chapters on the prophets seem to be rather uneven. Part of each chapter is a good summary of the teaching of the prophet, which should prove helpful to the general reader. But in each case this is prefaced by a discussion of technical points of introduction, with much citation of the names and opinions of scholars, such as will be both barren and frightening to that type of reader. On the other hand, the reader who is at home with the technicalities will find the latter parts of the chapters already familiar. However, this is a thoroughly competent book in which the history and religious thought of Israel in the sixth century B.C. is described against the background of the contemporary world situation. The reader who comes fresh to this period should, with a little skipping, find it helpful.

J. ROBINSON



## DEAD SEA SCROLLS

SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. By F. F. BRUCE. The Paternoster Press. 10s. 6d.

THE Qumran finds have now entered the stage which may be called post-sensational. This means, in effect, that their importance is apt to be overlooked after the initial *éclat* which was itself largely caused by the unwarranted conclusions of aggressively anti-Christian writers. Meantime the work of scholars continues, and until the whole material is made available—probably not until the mid-sixties—it is a pleasure to have an interim report from so competent a hand as the present author's. The work under review would make an excellent basis for a study-group together with T. H. Gaster's recent publication of translated texts.

Professor Bruce first goes over the factual ground of the discoveries, giving an account of the contents of the caves, and then proceeds to summarize the debate on the date. He himself inclines to a pre-Christian one, although he hesitates to be dogmatic on this point. The description of Khirbet Qumran is clear, but the reader may do well to look at the pictures in Allegro's Penguin to get an even more concrete impression. The chapter on the Scrolls and the Old Testament will help the layman to learn something about the whole problem of the transmission of the text in general and about the fluidity of the traditions and the fidelity of the copyists in particular. Arising out of this he will pursue with interest the somewhat technical question whether we may ultimately speak of a Qumran tradition of texts and the more direct and practical question whether Qumran variants should be made available in an English Bible.

The remaining part of the book deals with what may be called the controversial aspects of Qumran. "The Qumran community had its messianic doctrine. One point in which it differs from the messianic doctrine of the New Testament. . . is its expectation of three distinct personages at the end of the age, whereas the Christian Messiah was Prophet and Priest and King in one." Moreover, Jesus changed the very meaning of term "Messiah" by connecting it with the Suffering Servant. The celebrated Teacher of Righteousness may have been a hero of the past who died a martyr's death (Onias, Judah Ben-Gedidiah), hardly John the Baptist, certainly not Jesus, for the only thing that can be said about him (or about his office, or the expectation of a just teacher) is that he does not die an atoning death nor rises from the dead prior to the general resurrection. Professor Bruce links him, and his office, closely to the life of the actual community in the leadership of the *maskilim* who lived a disciplined life of monastic (Gnostic?) purpose. Rightly the author shows that the sectarian strands must be studied in detail before the relationship between the Teacher and Jesus, or between the community and the Church, can be stated with any usefulness. Our author gives a complete documentation of Essene life from Philo and Josephus before he examines the affinities and the dissimilarities between it and the Qumran way of life.

When the men of Qumran had to face the effects of Roman conquest they must have ceased to exist as an identifiable group, but their influence may have lingered on, possibly among the Ebionites. There must have been some sort of contact between some Jewish Christians and some members of the community, and this may have preceded the fall of Jerusalem; whether this relationship was hostile or friendly, sterile or fertile, remains a matter for conjecture. Professor Bruce gives a fair account of the views of Teicher, Allegro, Wilson, and Cullmann before he weighs up the evidence which, as he insists, must be viewed as a whole, i.e. within the context of Apocryphal and Rabbinic material. Baptism, asceticism, covenant, organization certainly cover common fields of belief and practice, but "their significance within the Christian community is controlled by the person and work of Jesus". Here, then, is a good guide to lead the reader through the maze of Christian origins to which Qumran has added further wealth.

U. E. SIMON

## THE APOCRYPHA

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE APOCRYPHA. By BRUCE M. METZGER. Oxford. 28s.

STUDENTS who have toiled with Pfeiffer's Introduction will be impressed by the difference of approach to be found in the book under review. Not only is the format more popular but the spirit also is fresher and altogether more enthusiastic. Professor Metzger, who is a *Neutestamentler* and a member of the Standard Bible Committee to which we owe the Revised Standard Version, addresses himself to the educated layman and not to the expert (for whom, presumably, Charles must still be the indispensable point of departure).

After some elementary remarks on the term "Apocrypha" and a brief survey of the growth of the Hebrew Canon, the author proceeds to give a survey of each book in turn. He is almost exclusively concerned to give an intelligible account of the contents, and he relegates critical questions to a short discussion at the end. Despite his restraint Professor Metzger gives his reader a good idea of the relative standing of each book from a literary and religious point of view; for example, he justly labels the Additions to Esther "wordy, not to say bombastic", and altogether indicative of inferior writing and thinking. When a summary is obviously out of the question, as in the case of Ecclesiasticus, Metzger still succeeds in conveying to his reader not only the main points of the book but also its place "as an important link in the development of ancient Judaism". Throughout, an admirably light touch makes the reading a pleasure, especially since the author is always aware of, and draws upon, the wide canvas of human culture. Thus, in

connection with Bel and Dragon, "one of the oldest detective stories in the world", he quotes from the Talmud, a modern American writer, and Edmund Spencer.

This urbane treatment becomes even more prominent and rewarding in the second part, which deals with general topics, such as the Apocrypha and the New Testament, a brief history of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church, and its pervasive influence. "It is chiefly in broadly cultural, sociological, and theological respects that the literary forms of the Apocrypha assist us in understanding the thought and life of first-century Jews in Palestine." Some readers may feel a trifle disappointed that the author deliberately withholds comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls, but the issues are surely quite complicated enough, and a detailed comparison, as that given between Wisdom and some New Testament writings for example, may whet the appetite for more. If we wish to descend into the abyss of comparisons proper we must turn to Charles and still await the publication of all the discoveries from the Judean desert.

The problem of the canonicity of the Apocryphal books is well stated. Professor Metzger has no axe to grind in favour of the inclusion of the Apocrypha. In giving us the quaint history of these writings he tacitly supports the "hesitating and ambivalent position", which Coverdale, for example, took. In other words, most of us rate them much inferior to the inspired Word and yet would rather not have them missed out. One wonders if Rome has spoken the last word on the subject in regarding the Apocryphal books as indisputably sacred and canonical. It would also be interesting to know if the British and Foreign Bible Society still goes over the old battle-fields discussing the pros and cons of former controversies.

The teacher's and preacher's attitude to the Apocrypha depends, however, not only on its authority but also on its influence, and in this respect the last chapter is quite invaluable. The whole western tradition of poetry, music, and art is brought before us with its specific debt to this corpus. Who would want to do without Judith, Tobit, and Suzanna? A visit to any of the major art galleries will reconcile the antagonist of the Apocrypha at least with its merits as a lasting source of the inspiration of some of the greatest painters. And if this is not enough certain *curiosa*, at the end of this book, will help to put the matter in the right perspective.

U. E. SIMON

## BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION

THE HEART OF THE BIBLE. By JEANNIE B. THOMSON DAVIES. Allen and Unwin. 15s.

THIS work is an edition in one volume of three books first published in 1933. Each book is complete in itself, with its own table of contents, pagination, and index. The first two deal with the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and the third with the New Testament. Taken together, the three books provide a history and conspectus of Biblical literature from the Song of Lamech in Genesis to the prophecy of the day of the Lord in 2 Peter. Each chapter begins with an explanatory introduction, and then gives a series of extracts from the relevant sections of the Bible. The extracts are arranged, as far as possible, according to the date of writing. The prose extracts are printed in paragraphs, and the poetical passages in stanzas, but precise references by chapter and verse are given in each case. The text is that of the Authorized Version, with occasional adaptations, as in the reading of "love" for "charity" in 1 Corinthians 13.

Any selection of representative passages from the Bible is open to criticism. The present work does not include the Johannine teaching on the Bread of Life, nor the account of the risen Master's meeting with Mary Magdalene, "the greatest recognition scene in all literature". Moreover, writing twenty-five years ago, the author expresses herself more confidently on some subjects, such as "The Q Document" and the Proto-Luke hypothesis, than she would probably do to-day. But this is a work intended for general readers, and they will find it a very helpful introduction to Biblical study.

G. J. INGLIS

## ECCLESIOLOGY

THE OXFORD DICTIONARY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Edited by F. L. CROSS. Oxford. 70s.

DR CROSS'S long-awaited Dictionary is a truly monumental work, vast in its scope and certain to stand for many years as an indispensable reference book. It is also a fascinating book for casual browsing over the whole field of Christian history, for it is packed with all kinds of absorbingly interesting information presented in a straightforward and untechnical form.

The editor and his assistants have been at work on this project for nearly twenty years, and the time must have been short for the task which they set themselves. Most of the articles have been provided with bibliographies, for the most part both adequate and remarkably up to



date. The whole work is elaborately cross-referenced, an asterisk being prefixed to the name of every person or thing for which a separate article is to be found under that heading. Great care has obviously been taken in harmonizing related articles and eliminating repetition and overlapping. The whole book is excellently produced.

The method followed in the Dictionary is historical. This is undoubtedly right, for the Christian Church can only be studied in the light of its origin and development, and its faith and doctrine are rooted in history. The corresponding disadvantage is that the book as a whole may give the uninstructed reader the impression that the Christian religion is an object of antiquarian research, belonging entirely to the past, and concerned almost exclusively with European people. This, however, is unavoidable if the subject is to be approached historically, and therefore without hope of attaining complete objectivity.

One of the most difficult tasks of the editor must have been the selection of his subjects. This has been excellently carried out, and there are few cases indeed where the reader might legitimately cavil at the editor's choice of material. One of these is perhaps the inclusion of articles on purely Biblical characters, such as Aaron and Abraham. There is no space for an adequate critical and historical treatment of these subjects, and the result is a number of rather naïve and jejune articles. The proportion of space allotted to some of the articles must also cause some surprise. In a few cases major Christian doctrines are dismissed in a relatively short article, such as that devoted to Regeneration, or that which treats of the Real Presence. On the other hand, certain characters in the history of the Church of England seem to receive somewhat disproportionately full treatment; the article on Pusey is considerably longer than those devoted either to Cyprian or to Cyril of Alexandria. This tendency is sometimes due to the markedly Anglican, and indeed "High Anglican", atmosphere which pervades the Dictionary as a whole and makes itself apparent in little touches here and there, such as the use of the phrase "definite Churchman" applied, *per contra*, to Dean Close.

It must not be supposed that this Tractarian bias seriously detracts from the general objectivity and reliability of the work as a whole; but it must be admitted that occasionally this tendency, combined with the Dictionary's preference for history as opposed to dogmatics, leads to a certain amount of distortion in a few of the articles on doctrine. Thus the article on "Original Sin" contains scarcely any information about either Anglican or Protestant teaching on the subject; Luther's doctrine of Justification is not dealt with fairly or adequately; there is no reference to Anglican doctrine in the articles on Justification, Election, or Predestination.

The more purely historical articles, in which the great strength and value of this Dictionary lie, are almost always fully adequate, accurate, and well documented. In a few instances they could be improved by reference to recent research; the articles on the Martyrs of Madaura and Glabrio are cases in point.



So far as the accuracy of a great work can be tested from a limited number of samples, it appears that the number of errors is extraordinarily small. In view of the vast number of complicated cross-references, this represents a remarkable achievement. Some minor mistakes must inevitably occur in a dictionary of this size, in spite of all the care of the editor and his staff. Among them may be mentioned references to non-existent articles on A. Nygren (cross-reference under "D'Arcy") and Davenant (cross-reference under "Dort"), and misprints in the heading of two articles on p. 401; the date of Dr Flemington's book, mentioned under "Infant Baptism" (but, surprisingly, not under "Baptism") should be 1948.

It would be absurd for a reviewer to mention such trifles without again laying stress on the immense value of this fine work, not only as a standard reference book, but also as a bedside book for the general reader—a function for which the interest of its contents commends it even more than its weight disqualifies it.

G. W. H. LAMPE

## FIRST STEP IN CANON LAW

THE CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF SARDICA. By HAMILTON HESS. Clarendon Press. 25s.

THIS book will be of considerable value to scholars and students who have a technical interest in the subject: it will hardly attract the general reader. This means that it still, even after revision, bears too many marks of the Ph.D. candidate and too few of the skilful book-maker. The examiners might with advantage have made some suggestions about the style and even, here and there, about the grammar. Nevertheless it embodies an impressive amount of research and we ought to be thankful that such a work of scholarship can appear from what appears to be a centre of pastoral care in Canada.

The book is a careful examination of the text and history of the canons of the council, which the author is happily still convinced was held in the year 343. A good deal of space is given to the question whether the Greek or Latin text is the earlier. Dr Hess gives good reasons for believing that there was a double redaction, pointing out that both languages were spoken at the council. In one of his most interesting passages he points out how easily a Greek interpreter could have understood Hosius to say *populis* when he actually said *pupillis*.

Dr Hess writes impartially. He thinks that the Roman attribution of the Sardican canons to Nicea was made in good faith. On the other hand he thinks the Roman interpretation of the right of appeal to the Pope much too legalistic. What was agreed upon was a friendly *ad hoc* arrangement rather than codified law. This helps to put the Sardican

canons in their proper place as an element leading towards the preparation of material for ultimate Canon Law rather than in original intention and authority part of Canon Law itself. In the process of developing his theme the author brings to light many forgotten details in the background of the period. Incidentally this means that Eusebius of Caesarea appears in a much more sinister light than he does in the traditional histories.

Altogether we have reason to be grateful for a painstaking piece of research. Henceforth the book will be quite indispensable to the advanced student of the period. The reader's task would be still further facilitated if in a new edition the canons could be printed out *in extenso* with double text and translation in parallel columns.

W.W.

### ORIGEN TRANSLATED

ORIGEN: THE SONG OF SONGS. Commentary and Homilies, translated and annotated by R. P. LAWSON. (Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XXVI.) Longmans. 21s.

ORIGEN composed three works on the Song of Songs, (i) some scholia, (ii) a detailed commentary in ten books, (iii) two homilies. The scholia, a work of his youth, have perished except for a single fragment in the Philocalia. Rufinus translated the Prologue and three books of the commentary, and this is all that survives of it, but for a few fragments in Greek *catenae*; and Jerome translated the two homilies, which are extant in his Latin version. The homilies were intended for babes in Christ, still at the breast, the commentary for the edification of the advanced Christian who can take meat. Both are products of Origen's full maturity. Partly because it was Jerome who translated them and partly, no doubt, because they are shorter and simpler, the homilies have been the better known and the more directly influential. Though intrinsically more important, the commentary has not previously been translated, it seems into a modern language.

The present volume, which contains English versions of both commentary and homilies, with an introduction and notes, should be assured of a wide welcome, for these are capital documents in the history of Christian spirituality. While the homilies give a comparatively brief exposition of the Song of Songs in terms of the relationship between Christ and the Church, the commentary sees in the Bride both the Church and the individual soul. Origen's interpretation is the principal source of all later spiritual exegesis of the Song (though we should not forget Hippolytus's commentary on it, used by St Ambrose) and also of a great deal of mystical meditation. In it we find, for example, his doctrine of the spiritual senses, the ladder of the seven canticles, by which

Church or soul mounts to repose in Christ, the ordering of love, the wound of love. It may not all be mystical in the technical sense, and I should want to use that word less freely than Mr Lawson does. Origen gives plenty of space to moral exhortation and intellectual speculation, while even what he says of union with Christ cannot always be taken as strictly mystical. But that both works have profoundly influenced the mystical tradition is beyond dispute, at any rate for the West. In the Eastern Church they largely succumbed to the general suspicion of their author.

As translated, the three extant books of the commentary cover 242 pages, so that with the introduction (18 pages), the homilies (40), and the notes (62), this is a larger volume than is usual in the series and without increase in price. So, although I should like to ask the editor for more, I must allow that it would be quite unfair to grumble. The translation is the main thing, and though it does not speak with the authentic voice of the twentieth century, as Monsignor Knox used to advocate, it is readable enough and accurate. Ideally, however, I would have liked a longer introduction, more notes, and the addition of the remaining fragments from Procopius, those, namely, which run on beyond Song 2. 15, where Book Three of the commentary ends. Sixty-two pages sounds enough for notes which do not purport to offer a complete commentary, but much of the space is required for the essential references to the Bible and to other passages in Origen. The notes we get are scholarly; what I chiefly miss is more reference to Origen's sources (there are a few to Philo and Clement) and some comparison with Hippolytus. Further, there might well be comment on some of the difficult points of doctrine raised by Origen. I cannot altogether rid myself of the suspicion that Mr Lawson, who is quick to remark on Origen's orthodoxy, has deliberately refrained from drawing attention to many awkward passages.

It is the introduction which I should most like to see strengthened. As it stands, it is useful but slight, never coming to grips with the subject matter. What is Origen doing with Scripture? Is this exegesis or eisegesis? Is there anything about the Church or the soul which he has really derived from the Song of Songs? Or, if we waive the question of derivation and authority, is the spiritual life which he describes really the expression of the Gospel? Why, and to what extent, is it confined to the perfect, and how much does intellect count in it? What does Origen make of love? Ready though I am to see a place for *Eros* in the Christian life, I cannot feel sure that Origen does full justice to *Agapé*, or satisfactorily relates the two. What in the end does he mean by spiritual, and what are the objects of a spiritual love? What is the place of material things in God's creation? One cannot forget that he will not allow that Jesus taught us to pray for material bread. Perhaps Mr Lawson would have liked space to tackle such questions. and to tell us something about manuscripts and editions. At

least he can reply that he puts us on to all the right books. The reader will do well to consult Dom Rousseau's introduction to the homilies in *Sources chrétiennes*.

I append a few details:

1. p. 31, line one: does not *immutata* mean "changed", rather than "unchanged" (cf. pp. 148, 210), even though Rufinus does also use it with the meaning "unchanged"?
2. pp. 100, 175, 176: in works of this date, better not to translate *presbyteri* as "priests"; p. 192 rightly has "presbyters".
3. p. 310, note 8: in *adulescentia* needs explanation, else it will puzzle the reader who has been told, correctly, that the two homilies are late works.
4. p. 322, n. 122: the note on apocrypha is more confusing than elucidatory.
5. p. 353, n. 177: for *filli* read *fili*.
6. p. 363, n. 41: We might have a reference to Cyprian's different use of this text in relation to the unity of the Church.
7. Finally, one example of doctrinal difficulty passed over. On p. 59, Origen says that the Church is the whole assembly of saints. A note explains that for St Paul, "saints" means "the Christian faithful", and for the Fathers it means "the living Church on earth". On p. 251 Origen says that the souls who have reached perfection (by which he does not here mean baptism) together make up the body of the Church. No note on this!

Though one would welcome tougher theological comment, this is not necessarily the aim of the series. My criticisms otherwise are marginal; a very useful and welcome book.

S. L. GREENSLADE

## DOCTRINAL ORIGINS

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. By MARTIN WERNER. Translated by S. G. F. BRANDON. A. & C. Black. 30s.

THIS translation (in abbreviated form) of Martin Werner's learned reinterpretation of the history of Christian doctrine introduces English readers to a serious challenge to the generally accepted account of the development of doctrine in the early Church. The fundamental question which the author raises is whether the evolution of the Christian Faith in the Patristic period represents an apostasy from the first faith, or an elucidation of the New Testament data and their transposition into a different key. His own solution is the former, but he differs from scholars like Harnack in finding the clue in the progressive "deschatologization" of Primitive Christianity in terms of Hellenism rather than as a direct process of Hellenization involving as a corollary a



reduction in compass of early eschatology. It is in many ways a brilliant book which works out a thesis with ruthless consistency and considerable learning. It is, however, not lacking in perversity, and its fondness for sharply drawn contrasts and sweeping characterizations seriously affects its adequacy as an account of the process which it seeks to describe.

Werner champions Schweitzer's theory of Consistent Futurist Eschatology in which he finds the only possible alternative to the historical scepticism of the Form Critical School. He discounts the elements of truth in realized eschatology as expounded by Dodd and Jeremias. Many will, however, believe that the teaching of Jesus on the Kingdom was richer and more complex than either school maintains. While Werner is probably right in considering 1 Enoch as one of the sources of Jesus, he does not appear to take adequate account either of the influence of the prophetic tradition on the teaching of Jesus or of the probable extent to which our Lord modifies his sources by applying them to himself.

There are similar weaknesses in his account of St Paul. While at least in his earlier period St Paul seems to have expected an early Parousia, the extent to which this fact governs his entire theology is more debatable than Werner allows. Some aspects of his theology arise more naturally from his pastoral, missionary, and apologetic concerns than from his eschatology. Werner claims that his critique of the Law is based upon doubts as to its sanction and permanence rather than its content. It is the "letter that kills" from which Christ delivers us through his death, but for the brief interval that remains before the Parousia each should remain as he is. But this gives an inadequate explanation of the circumcision issue which seems to involve a critique of content. The Pauline attitude to the Law seems rather to rest upon three facts, none of which is directly connected with eschatology, St Paul's pride in the Law as a Jew, the need for moral instruction for his Gentile converts which the Law provides for the Jew, and his own experience that as a religious principle the Law could not give life. Pauline Christology is depicted as an Angel Christology. The *Kurios Christos* is a high angelic power subordinated to God, but entrusted with a special commission which had both beginning and end, an agent in creation and the victor over the demonic powers. In the human Jesus this angelic being was transformed into human guise and crucified by the (angelic) world rulers in ignorance of his true nature. This theory, it is claimed, explains the bias towards Monophysitism in Pauline Christology. It is very doubtful whether this theory will hold. While the title *Kurios* could certainly be used of angels, it is also one of the standard descriptions of God in the Septuagint. The Christology of the later epistles seems particularly hard to reconcile with this theory, and the alleged Monophysitism of Pauline Christology has been greatly exaggerated. A passage like Gal. 4. 4 stands firmly on the other side. The facts are better explained by the view that St Paul is really groping for the right categories to use for our Lord. On occasion the title "God"



seems to tremble on his pen, but he is not yet in a position to handle the theological problems involved, and honesty of mind compels caution. Werner interprets with uncompromising literalness expressions like dying with Christ, rising with Christ, and the Body of Christ. The Christian is in a literal (though eschatological) sense a new creation. But the question whether this is an eschatological fact (and in what sense) or a spiritual experience, possibly seen by St Paul in an eschatological perspective, though capable of translation into a different idiom, is more open than Werner allows. It has an obvious bearing upon the development of the Church's doctrine of Redemption.

Werner's interpretation of the development of doctrine rests upon far too narrow a basis. While "de-eschatologization" may not always have received the attention which it deserves, the process was certainly far from complete. The *inde venturus* finds its place in the Creeds and even chiliasm persisted for some centuries. The doctrine of the overthrow of the demonic powers was even widened and in some respects heightened in the early Church. Unless we accept Werner's somewhat distorted account of the content of New Testament religion, some doctrines were obviously affected less directly than others. Other motives for development were the theological deployment of the New Testament subject matter and the problem of communication imposed upon the Church by her missionary work in a predominantly Hellenistic milieu. These may ultimately be of greater significance than Werner's own theory.

Werner has an unusually low opinion both of the integrity and theological competence of the early Church, and has correspondingly little sympathy with the classical doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Here with Harnack he suspects Gnostic influence, openly condemned but surreptitiously accepted. I have tried elsewhere to examine the elements of truth and error in this hypothesis and reach a different conclusion. Differences here are just as significant as superficial similarities. He claims that Angel Christology persisted until its final suppression in the Arian controversy. The evidence mainly depends upon the consequences of splinter groups like the Elchasaites and the less happy expressions of theologians such as Hermas and Lactantius. Two other classes of evidence, the interpretation of the angelophanies of the Old Testament as Christophanies and the Subordinationism of many early writers really belong rather to the Logos tradition than to Angel Christology proper. The former may not be scientific exegesis but derives from the attempt to make the Old Testament Christologically significant, the latter has more connection with the difficulty of the relation between the Godhead and the material universe which faced any theology which employed Greek methods of thought. The correspondence of the new idea of the divinity of Christ with the themes of Hellenistic folk religion is asserted on the strength of analogies employed by the apologist Justin. These are better understood as apologetic parallels such as have often been used by missionaries to introduce Christian ideas than as a theological restrictive practice. Against

classical Trinitarianism Werner urges a point made in its favour by writers like St Basil that it represented a numerical *via media* between undifferentiated monotheism and unmitigated polytheism. It is better understood as an attempt to draw out the necessary implications of the New Testament data for the basic monotheism of the Jewish tradition. Whatever the unsolved problems of Chalcedonian Christology, it represents a more adequate account of the implications of the New Testament doctrine of Christ than the inconclusive pattern of thought which Werner ascribes to St Paul. One curious fact emerges from Werner's treatment; there is a general similarity of rhythm between his interpretation of Pauline Christology and later doctrines of the Incarnation. If this be the case, few will doubt which is the more adequate presentation of the mystery of Jesus.

An Addendum (drawn largely from another of Werner's works) carries the story down to modern times. Protestantism (for Werner) rightly challenged the formulations of the early and medieval Church and sought to retrace its steps. It failed, however, to frame its question aright. Neither the pure eschatological doctrine of the New Testament nor the emergent doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation are acceptable as they stand. A similar revaluation must take place in the doctrines of Redemption and of the Church. But this does not mean, as timorous spirits both Catholic and Protestant fear, the end of Christianity. The process of de-eschatologization carried to its appropriate limits will reveal the true nature of Christianity. But at least in his present work Werner does not tell us what emerges from the crucible (or what can be salvaged from the wreck). We shall be waiting to learn, but in the meantime a critical negativism which is prepared to jettison much of the New Testament and nearly all the early Church may well appear a somewhat discouraging starting-point for such an enterprise.

H. E. W. TURNER

## CYRILLINE ANTHROPOLOGY

THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN ACCORDING TO CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (Studies in Christian Antiquity, No. 14). By WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J. The Catholic University of America Press. \$3.00.

VERY few, I suppose, have leisure to study the fathers. They are diffuse, often repetitive. On the other hand to neglect them is seriously to impoverish our knowledge of Christian theology. Such studies as this answer the difficulty. What in the original writings is scattered and must be mined laboriously is extracted, arranged, and commented so as to present a consecutive account of a particular father's teaching on some fundamental doctrine. In this case it is St Cyril of Alexandria's understanding of the divine image in man as it was at his creation, as it

survived his fall, and as it is not merely restored but perfected in Christ and the Christian united with Christ. We are not only introduced into the heart of Cyril's theology but by way of comparison into the theology of his predecessors, Irenaeus for example, Clement, Origen, Athanasius.

Cyril, correctly it seems, does not differentiate between the "image" and "likeness" of God in Genesis 1. 26-7. The image is in man's soul, not his body. It has many facets. It is intelligence, a natural endowment to be sure, but with an orientation to supernatural faith and contemplation. Cyril's language, however, is somewhat ambiguous on this point. Clear differentiation between God's gifts, graces, of nature and supernature had not yet been achieved. In particular the image is free will. Man has indeed a natural appetite for good. It is also dominion over the earth, sovereignty over the irrational creation.

All these aspects of the image are however secondary. Primarily God's image in man is holiness, the sanctification which is no less than participation in the Divine Nature. This holiness is both ontological, a quality of the soul, and dynamic, the practice of a holy life. This holiness involves incorruptibility, not simply immortality of soul and risen body, but God's own life communicated to the soul. Moreover it is adopted Sonship bestowed by communion with the risen Christ and therefore in Cyril's view not possessed even by Adam in paradise.

Sin deformed and defiled the Divine image. But it did not destroy it. Supernatural holiness indeed was lost. But rationality remained and therefore, though weakened, free will.

All this amounts to a rich and a balanced Christian anthropology, which, while recognizing fully the supernatural, even divine life given by the Incarnation leaves room for the humanism which had been proclaimed by Greek philosophy. Less satisfactory is Cyril's view of woman, the subject of a most interesting chapter. As a theologian indeed he admits that woman like man possesses the Divine image restored and perfected by Christ, though in accordance with St Paul's teaching in his first epistle to the Corinthians mediated by the image in the male sex. From the psychological standpoint, however, he is a contemptuous misogynist. He can even apologize for a supposed breakdown of Mary beneath the Cross and disbelief in her Son as inevitable in a weak woman. It seems clear that, although Cyril's successful affirmation of our Lady's title, Mother of God, and its definition at the Council of Ephesus gave a powerful impetus to the development of Marian devotion, his motive was solely the desire to safeguard the doctrine of her Son's divinity not devotion to his Mother. It was surely an oversight of the author which included among the heroines of Greek legend Clytemnestra, her husband's murderer (136). And it was not the tree of life but the tree of the knowledge of good and evil whose fruit was forbidden to Adam and Eve (142).

Though the tomes of the fathers are likely to remain unread save by a few specialists in the school of theology we may hope for libraries well stocked with such monographs as Father Burghardt's.

E. I. WATKIN

## ST THOMAS AQUINAS

THE SILENCE OF ST THOMAS: THREE ESSAYS. By JOSEF PIEPER.  
Translated by DANIEL O'CONNOR. Faber. 12s. 6d.

THIS small book consists of three short essays, originally published separately in German, together with a Chronological Table. Those who are a little rusty as regards the history of the thirteenth century in Europe will find it enlightening to study this table first. St Thomas Aquinas' life covered the middle part of that century: he died before he was 50. From the table printed here one can see how this fits in to the long life of St Albertus Magnus, when the Emperor Frederick II lived and died, the dates of the deaths of St Dominic and St Francis (just before and after Thomas' birth), and much else which helps in forming the general picture. It was under the tutelage of the Irishman, Peter of Hibernia, that Thomas became acquainted with the writings of Aristotle, which had such a profound effect upon his future work. To call a man an Aristotelian at that time was from the lips of the orthodox comparable to dubbing him a free-thinker or a Nihilist. This subject and that of the mendicant friars indicate the two disputes which in the first half of the thirteenth century caused violent and passionate controversy in Christendom. Franciscans were demented, heretical, even anti-Christ. But young men of noble birth were not thus to be put off: the Friaries at Paris, Bologna, and Naples received many recruits from the student bodies. At the age of 20, Thomas entered the Order of St Dominic with its ideals of both poverty and study, despite the efforts of his family to detain him by force. His stormy career is here described, and he is seen as a man whose imposing calm grows in proportion to the noise and tumult around him. Never was he known to lose his composure. In the atmosphere of continual polemic his literary output of lastingly invaluable matter was prodigious. He was canonized less than 50 years after his death. The trait in him which witnesses constantly stressed was *Castitas*. He was a man of such radiant purity that those who came into his presence were at once aware of it. He wrote a prayer asking for cheerfulness without frivolity and to become mature without ever being pompous. He had a passion for Truth, and in his longing that the young should find it, the *Summa* was expressly written *ad eruditionem incipientium*. As against medieval Augustinism Thomas taught that all created things are good, because God created them. The Fourth Evangelist said that the Word was made *flesh* to exclude the Manichean idea that the body is evil. As against the teaching of Averroes, the great commentator on Aristotle, who severed the connection between faith and reason, Thomas unwaveringly affirmed that the Christian can neither seek nor find a wisdom outside Christ. Dr Pieper is concerned to show that Thomas' last word to his readers is "not communication, but silence". He had never feared the "bold light of logic"; and it had led him to the boundary of mystery. It was not death which caused him to cease writing: it was some supernatural glimpse which had been



given him into the unseen. Abruptly, in the middle of a treatise on Penance, he stopped and said he could write no more. All his works seemed to him as straw compared with what had been revealed. This leads Dr Pieper on to a profound study of the negative element in Thomas' teaching. Paradoxically he finds a parallelism between Thomas and Sartre. This section must be read to be appreciated, but it may briefly be summed up in the words: "Things are unfathomable because they are created." The relevance of Thomism to modern Existentialism is further drawn out in the third essay. In his philosophical inquiry man finds repeatedly that reality is unfathomable and Being a mystery, and is often thus impelled to remain silent: but this is a silence not of despair, but of reverence for that which cannot be known.

FREDERIC HOOD

## THE PATRIARCH NICEPHORUS

ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY AND IMAGE WORSHIP IN THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE.

By P. J. ALEXANDER. Oxford. 50s.

THE author of this book is an American scholar who is Professor of History at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. He has given special attention to an unedited work of the Patriarch Nicephorus, his *Refutatio et Eversio*, a summary of which he includes. The main attention of the book is directed, as its title suggests, to the events with which Nicephorus was concerned. Appointed Patriarch in 806 by the Emperor of the same name, Nicephorus resigned his see in 815 and retired to live in obscurity until his death in 828.

Professor Alexander has provided a careful and thorough examination of the period, and on several points he is able to correct the conclusions of earlier writers. The events themselves are examined, and the arguments used in the controversies of the times are dissected, together with the details of the works of Nicephorus himself. The results of his researches will certainly be of importance to scholars of a period in which there is too little available in English.

But the main interest of a study of this period is the light which is shed on the general history of the iconoclastic period. To those members of the Church of England who are interested in relations with the Orthodox Churches of the East this period is important because it is that of the Seventh Oecumenical Council (Nicaea 787), the acceptance of which is considered indispensable by all Orthodox theologians.

In dealing with his subject Professor Alexander gives a sketch of the development of images and of the various attitudes towards them both before and after the Council. He does not examine the Council itself, nor does he try to expound the distinctions made by that Council between various types of worship, and which type it is proper to accord



to ikons. But he provides a picture of the atmosphere in which the decisions were taken, and of the various warring elements in the Church and Empire.

It is interesting to note how pagan arguments which were used against Christian attack on pagan images were taken over and used by the Christians themselves after the adoption of Christianity by the Empire. The justification of images as symbols was transferred lock, stock, and barrel to Christian pictures. In the second iconoclastic controversy, which began in 815, new arguments were used, based on scholastic conceptions, which now seem to have little relevance.

Nicephorus witnessed two important struggles. The first was that between the Emperor and the Church, and the second that between the secular and monastic clergy. It was the monks, led by Theodore of Studium, who were in the forefront of resistance to the Emperor's iconoclastic policy. The secular clergy, and the Patriarch in particular, were often dependent for their positions on the Emperor. Nicephorus showed himself far more ready to oppose the Emperor after the death in 811 of his namesake, by whom he had been appointed.

It must be confessed that the monks were often extreme in their views, a characteristic which is not unknown even in the twentieth century, and it is probable that their exaggerated behaviour hindered rather than helped their cause. Their opposition to the Emperor was, sad to say, diminished after he had hit on the device of appointing monks to bishoprics, instead of confining his appointments to secular clergy.

It is remarkable how well the Church has survived in spite of the power of the Emperor to impose his own views upon it. It is certainly true that Emperors could not have had success with an iconoclastic policy unless there had been latent support for their views in the Church itself. Nevertheless it is plain that Emperors intervened far too much in doctrinal matters and that Patriarchs were too ready to give way. It is to the credit of Nicephorus that he resigned in 815 rather than support an iconoclastic policy, and that he devoted the rest of his life to writing against such a policy.

One other aspect of interest in the controversy is the question why the Council of 787 came to be regarded as Oecumenical rather than those of 754, 815 or 830 all of which were iconoclast. The controversy was finally ended with the Council of Constantinople of 843. It would seem that a Council can only be accorded Oecumenical recognition *ex consensu fidelium*, for it is only on this basis that the Councils can be distinguished in character.

This book is a useful addition to the literature of an important period of Church history.

H. M. WADDAMS

## LUTHER V. ERASMUS

THE BONDAGE OF THE WILL. By MARTIN LUTHER. Translated by J. I. PACKER and O. R. JOHNSTON. James Clarke. 15s.

FROM the moment Luther stepped into the forefront of the theological struggles of the early sixteenth century, the world began to wonder and speculate what relationship would grow up between his older and now world famous contemporary Erasmus and the younger unknown Luther. At first, Erasmus used his influence to win for Luther freedom to write, speak and think. But it soon became apparent both to Luther and Erasmus how wide the gulf was which separated the two men.

Erasmus was not a theologian, and sought to reduce Christianity to a simpler, non-doctrinal, ethical system, while Luther was now a powerful theologian of Augustinian leanings. Erasmus was the neutral type preaching non-involvement, while Luther taught total commitment. Erasmus laughed wittily at the tragedy of the early sixteenth century ecclesiastical scene, while Luther cried to God for deliverance. To Erasmus the whole matter was merely an intellectual dispute, to Luther the entire Gospel was at stake. The men were bound to clash, and, goaded into action by friend and foe, Erasmus attacked Luther in 1524 on Luther's doctrine of the impotence of the will in unredeemed man. Luther's reply, *de servo arbitrio*, appeared in 1525, the most important of all his theological treatises.

This book is the medicine for all those who hanker after a reformation on Erasmian lines. Luther attacks the doctrinal indifferentism of Erasmus. To Luther, the expression and formulation of the Gospel is but the expression of doctrine, and to be neutral here is to be faithless. Similarly, he attacked the Pope, not because of the Pope's scandalous life, as other reformers had done before him, but because of his false doctrine by which countless souls were imperilled. The man who does not know the bondage of his will in sin has not learned any part whatsoever of the Gospel, and while he is in this error will never understand it. This is the heart of the matter, and Luther knew that to select this point of his theology was to "seize him by the throat".

There has been, and is, much misunderstanding of the meaning Luther attached to the phrase "the enslaved will". Luther, of course, believed in free psychological choice, that a man may do as he chooses, eat what he chooses, marry whom he chooses, and do generally just as he chooses. He meant that in the matter of man's salvation man was not free to earn by meritorious deeds, by his own ideas of redemption, nor by any other humanly conceived way or method, his own salvation and peace with God. He believed without any modifications of any kind, that natural unredeemed man has no power and knows no way to effect his own redemption, and can only continue in his own sin and self-centredness. Erasmus, with the Papists, taught that meritorious application to spiritual concerns secured or started the process of man's salvation. Erasmus still accepted the medieval theology of congruent

and condign merit, which in essence means that man, by the efforts of his will, achieved those changes in his life which finally made him worthy of God's saving grace. Such views Luther had rejected ten years earlier, and any ideas of human merit, even when modified by learned epithets like condign and congruent, were not made any the more true. This theology Luther believed Pelagian, or more correctly worse than Pelagian, for it did not even make the high demands that Pelagius did in fact make. To Luther, the natural man's reason in the matter of working out his own salvation is blinded, his self-centred will hostile to God's, and his choice, though he thinks it a free choice, is always sinful and self-centred. Erasmus teaches that grace is elicited by merit, Luther that it is freely offered without consideration of merit or demerit. Erasmus thinks of grace and the Spirit as spiritualizing influences which strengthen the human spirit in its strivings, but essentially of the same nature. Luther thinks in terms of a total new creation of man's corrupt nature when God calls a man to faith in Christ; a new nature pouring forth of God the works of God. All is of God.

The argument of the book reads strange to modern minds, but this very strangeness might serve to show more clearly our tenuous hold on Reformation theology which always brings us back to Biblical categories and away from a too prevalent humanist, ethicist approach. A study of this book would serve to release modern theology, particularly in England, from its anthropocentric ideas and notions of God and His dealings with man, to a Biblical conception of His Sovereignty and Grace. We have lapsed into an Erasmian synergism.

The translators have produced a readable and vigorous translation of a hard text. This has been wanted for the last fifty years, and the theological world is indebted to them. They also provide a brief but excellent introduction, and help the reader with a useful synopsis of the argument of the book at the outset. The advanced student may feel the need of more comments and references than the translators do in fact provide, and perhaps also a longer and more critical introduction to the dispute between Erasmus and Luther, but what is provided is good, well-produced, and remarkably cheap at fifteen shillings.

JAMES ATKINSON

## THE EARLY LUTHER

THE REVOLT OF MARTIN LUTHER. By ROBERT HERNDON FIFE. Columbia University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 78s.

IF THE measure of a man's greatness be the quantity of literature, biographical, expository, and critical, which he provokes, then Luther's greatness is beyond dispute. Already the bibliographies of Lutheriana reduce the conscientious student to near despair—Professor Fife's, expressly designated "Selected", occupies eighteen pages whilst his book

covers only that portion of Luther's life which extends up to the Diet of Worms—and there seems no reason why the spate of writing should ever cease. In part this testifies to the immeasurable influence of the man upon European history, but perhaps even more to his protean character. His intense and febrile productivity reflects the turbulent and overflowing mind of one who scarcely for a moment ceased to speak and to write upon almost every topic in theology. This in itself gives endless scope for new studies, both controversial and otherwise. No less incentive to the researcher is given by the intricate relationships of the Lutheran movement with the tangled and all too well documented political history of the early sixteenth century.

It is in this last field of study that Professor Fife's large-scale book is especially valuable. Interested in Luther since his earliest days, the author has evidently pursued his studies relentlessly since before 1928, when he published his *Olaus Petri Lectures, Young Luther*, delivered at the suggestion of the late Archbishop Söderblom. As he tells us in his introduction, he is "no theologian"—and indeed the book displays at times a certain weakness in technical theological knowledge, despite a conscientious effort to understand the issues involved—but his knowledge of the German background of Luther's life is extensive, as one would expect in the case of an Emeritus Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures of Columbia University. This enables him to see some matters more clearly than is possible for an author whose approach is narrowly theological.

The book is a detailed narrative of Luther's life and intellectual development up to and including the first part of 1521, when the reformer made his decisive stand before the great ones of the Empire at Worms. As such it is singularly complete, showing the results of a close study of the sources and secondary authorities, and its references will be a mine for English students of the period. On the sources of Luther's ideas and the influence of his education and early experiences Professor Fife has little new to tell us, although he expounds the facts and probabilities well. It is when Luther, just before 1517, begins to enter into public controversy that his treatment becomes most interesting. He brings out better than has often been done the extent to which academic rivalry both stimulated and embittered theological divergencies. Wittenberg, we are apt to forget, was a very new university when Luther began to teach there. Its patron, the Elector of Saxony, had high hopes for it and undoubtedly wished it to rival Leipzig, founded nearly a century earlier, and under the patronage and control of the Albertine Duke of Saxony, head of the rival branch of the Wettin family. New universities, anxious to place themselves "on the map", are fertile ground for new ideas and, without throwing doubt upon the sincerity of its exponents, one may legitimately think that the fervour of the "Wittenberg theology", as it was significantly called, the anti-scholastic Augustinian revival promoted by Luther and Carlstadt before ever the indulgence controversy arose, owed something to the challenge of older universities in general and Leipzig in particular. Certainly, as Professor Fife well



shows, the acerbity of the debate with Eck in 1519 was increased by the fact that it was held at Leipzig and treated as an academic joust. One cannot fail to see that the Reformation controversies were bedevilled from the first by the academic partisanship characteristic of the time, which set loyalty above truth, and thereby were made far more intractable.

Our author is no less successful in showing how much disservice was done by Luther's supporters in the Electoral Court on the one hand and the representatives of Empire and Papacy on the other, who approached problems from a diplomatic angle and were primarily concerned to find face-saving formulae, maintain prestige, and smooth out the political difficulties caused by the nation-wide controversy stirred up, almost unconsciously, by a friar whose interests had hitherto been academic. Diplomats are constitutionally almost incapable of understanding religious disputes, and their instinct is to stifle rather than to resolve them. The diplomats of the sixteenth century were not too successful even in their own proper field of international relations, and their well meant intervention in the Lutheran controversy was a disaster for religion.

Another point well made by Professor Fife is that Luther's most fervent supporters in the earlier stages of the Reformation had also little understanding of what was really at stake. "... Martin felt behind him at this time the ardent backing of two classes, the theologians of humanistic sympathies and the Franconian knights. It was the former who were to flood Germany with pamphlet literature in advocacy of the Reformation in the next two years. . . . As has been stated there is in that literature very little understanding of Luther's theological ideas. What appealed to the eager and at times almost incoherent authors of these polemics was the social import of such works as the *Address to the Christian Nobility* and *The Freedom of a Christian*. They showed only a languid interest in Luther's ideas on the enslaved will and redemption from sin. These ideas were even further from the knowledge of men of Hutten's social class, the economically depressed knights of the empire. Their goal was the destruction of the money- and position-grabbing hierarchy, where their demands did not go further and call for complete freedom from Rome" (p. 679). The drawing apart of Luther and the humanists in later years has often been noted; it is less often realized that they, the nationalists and Luther, started from different standpoints, and that Luther in these early years of his protest found himself by force of circumstances the David of an Adullamite party. It is this fact among others which partly explains why from being a national hero he became later only the leader of a schism within the Empire.

As already mentioned, the weaknesses of the book lie in the theological field. Professor Fife is indeed not a theologian. No one who was could write of Luther's speaking "the words of the offertory, consecrating the Host" (p. 100) even though the initial mistake here is one in his source. But there are at many points phrases which show unfamiliarity with ecclesiastical usage. Our author speaks of Aquinas as the



"Celestial Father" (p. 113), rather than the Angelic Doctor; 2 July, the Visitation, is described as "the Feast of the Virgin" (p. 73); St Cyprian figures as "Bishop Cyprian of Antioch" and is numbered among "early medieval ecclesiastics" (p. 212); a non-existent "Rule of St Bernard" appears on p. 79, the context suggesting that St Benedict's Rule is meant; St Paul is made to write to "the little community at Galatea" (*sic*, p. 231) in the Epistle to the Galatians. A very misleading account of the origin of Luther's order, the Austin Friars, is given on pp. 75-6; had it been, as here suggested, simply a mendicant order of Franciscan type, without an eremitical background, some of Luther's problems about the cloistered life might not have been so acute. On p. 249 it is probably the ambiguity of the word *indulgentia* which leads our author to speak of a dispensation to eat *lactinia* in Lent as an "indulgence" and to use it as an illustration of the system. On the following page the whole point of the extraordinary arrangement whereby Albert of Brandenburg was allowed to hold two archiepiscopal sees in plurality is missed when he is described as "bishop of Magdeburg". More serious errors are a failure to understand the integration of the Platonic "ideas" in Thomist Aristotelianism (p. 61), and the suggestion made on p. 63 that Nominalism was regarded as savouring of heresy; in the fifteenth century, ironical as it may seem to-day, it was Realism which, because of its connection with Wycliffe and Huss, smelled of the faggot in many noses.

It is only the reader himself unfamiliar with church matters who will be seriously misled by slips of this kind. Those with some theological information, and especially those who are inclined to overlook the action and reaction of secular affairs upon religion, will read it with profit. We can be grateful for a book which, if far from being a classic or marked by profound insight, collects together a mass of useful information.

THOMAS M. PARKER

## THE QUAKERS

QUAKERISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By HENRY J. CADBURY. Allen and Unwin. Cloth 6s., paper 4s. 6d.

IN THIS Swarthmore Lecture a distinguished scholar of early Christianity draws interesting parallels between the rise of Christianity in the First Century and the rise of Quakerism in the Seventeenth.

The religious experience of George Fox was different from that of a number of Reformation figures and of the Wesleys. Whereas their illumination sprang from the Scriptures, Fox's experience of the inner light was independent of the Scriptures though he found it validated by them. In consequence it is not wholly surprising to find a Quaker lecturer declaring that "it is precisely with much that the Church has

called heresy that we as Friends find most affinity in the past" and to state that the question, "May I as a Moslem also become a Quaker?" cannot be lightly evaded. "I am content", writes Dr Cadbury, "that Quakerism should be almost everyone's second choice. Under proportional representation we might have a very large vote."

It will be seen that though this small volume sets out to draw parallels between Quakerism and early Christianity it is not afraid to draw contrasts with accepted orthodoxy. After reading this lecture some may still consider Quakerism their second choice, but become all the more confirmed in their first.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

## ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

THE MYSTICAL THEOLOGY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH. By VLADIMIR LOSSKY.  
Translation. James Clark. 16s.

IT IS fitting to mention with deep regret the recent and sudden death of Professor Lossky in Paris, and to record the loss to the religious and philosophical world of this brilliant and profound interpreter of Orthodox theology and of this devout Christian. This *essai* was originally written in French and published in Paris fourteen years ago. In its original form (of which this is the translation) it has been the *vade mecum* of many students of Orthodoxy. The translation offered here by a small group of members of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius has been eagerly awaited for a good many years. The result shows at times the extreme difficulty of the task undertaken: the translation of the mind of a Russian writing in French, with the continual undercurrent of the wealth of Greek patristic quotation; the rendering into English of so precise and logical a language as French, so delicately adjusted a medium as Greek.

The title of the book is important. This is not an attempt to deal with Orthodox theology as a whole, but is by definition the study of mystical theology, by which the author means that of a spirituality which expresses a doctrinal attitude, "mystical" having that general and diffused sense, representing the character of true "Theology" in the full patristic sense of the study and knowledge of divine things. These are mystical in that they go beyond the range of purely intellectual apprehension, and are ultimately apophatic. It is the contention of the author throughout this study that spirituality must have a dogmatic basis, and that in turn dogma be made living and interpreted by the depths of Christian experience, in the humility and awe of a created being faced with the unknowability of the essential Divinity.

Thus the author's treatment begins with the nature of God. It is here that very particular attention is called for to his exposition, so amply

and broadly based on the homogeneity of Orthodox dogmatic teaching and interpretation, from the patristic age down to the present day. God who in his *ousia* is incomprehensible, is above and beyond any category we can apply to him, even that of existence, yet reveals to us his One Nature in three hypostases, through his divine uncreated energies in such a way as to be communicable to us, and to be co-operated with by us.

This doctrine (finding its classical expression specifically in the teaching of Denys the Areopagite and the Palamite theology, but of much earlier, if not earliest implicit presence in Christian thought), is peculiarly important for the interpretation of Orthodox Christian anthropology. Without it, any "partaking of the divine nature", and *theosis* for man would be impossible of attainment, and its very definition blasphemous. Moreover, without it there could only be ultimate absorption into the Divine, and the overthrowing of the basic distinction between the created and the uncreated, as expressed in the neoplatonic and Asiatic systems of thought. The Christian by divine uncreated Grace receives a second and divinized nature by adoption, and endlessly approximates by the ardour of love, to God, yet never coincides, never loses his created status and nature, never ceases to be a human person.

In his treatment of the divine Economy of the Three Persons of the Trinity, it is clear that he emphasizes the root and fount of unity and "monarchy" of the Father, yet without any inequality of Godhead of the Three Persons. Of that root of Unity, the Son is eternally begotten, and from that same principle of unity, the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeds. Such is the original formula, obscured by a "double procession" of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Nor is he content, following the constant Tradition of Orthodoxy, to regard the Holy Spirit as merely a bond of reciprocal union between the Father and the Son. All Three Persons are Lord and God. On the eternal level of the Divine Nature, the persons of the Son and of the Spirit proceed from the Father, "the unique source of deity" as St John Damascene teaches: yet on the level of the temporal mission, *by an act of will* common to the Three, the Father sends the Son, who is incarnate by the Holy Spirit. Similarly with the temporal mission of the Spirit, by the common will of the Three, he is sent by the Father and imparted by the Son, since the Holy Trinity is indivisible as to substance, nature, and will.

On the difficult subject of the personality of God (in view of the insistence of Eastern theology on the ultimately apophatic character of the Godhead), in faithfulness to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, the author defines that as a *personal absolute*, regarding it as an irreducible antinomy of thought, as indeed is the trinitarian formula itself.

One of the most inspired subjects treated of in this book is that of human personality: of the human person as distinct from and infinitely more than the individual, himself a microcosm of the whole of humanity, and reflecting in his personality the image and likeness of God. Union with God, the end of mystical theology, of spiritual *gnosis*, is worked out in human persons. Growth in divine uncreated Grace is an increasing quality of awareness of the divine Light, an acquiring of the Holy Spirit.

Human nature under divine Grace becomes two-fold, but its hypostases are myriad.

Finally while Orthodox spirituality has made, perforce, use of many philosophical terms, it is bound to no philosophical system—indeed freely uses such terms in its own connotation and meaning, interpreted by the Holy Scriptures and Tradition.

It is clear from even these poor attempts in a short review, that the differences in the theology of the East and the West have become very real. Starting from the possession of a common treasure, the centuries (of separation particularly) have accentuated them. Here in this study we are able more clearly to discern their roots. And we are reminded that it is not a mere difference of ways of thinking, but of living the Christian life that is involved: of the ultimate mysteries of the divine plan and purpose for man, of the ways of God's commerce with man, of man's ultimate partaking of the divine nature. It is worth while tackling a somewhat close and arduous study of Orthodox spiritual theology, as set out in this book (itself a condensing of an immense theme), which can only touch the fringes of its richness and depth.

One criticism may be ventured. It is of the same character as that made by Rolt in his very important study of Dionysius the Areopagite. There seems, to the western mind at least, a certain lack of balance in the exposition here of Eastern spirituality on the central character and emphasis of the Cross, as presented to us in the Gospels, each one of which would appear to be presented as a proem to the Passion and death of Our Lord, as a procession of the predestined Lamb to the place of sacrifice—and indeed which is the ruling Pauline theme. We are aware of the overshadowing of later western medieval thought by the crucifix, of the unbalance there, perpetuated by some aspects of the Reform, but here in the religion of the Resurrection, of the New Creation, of the Marriage Feast of the Lamb, there would appear to be a lack of emphasis of the centrality of Calvary and the Cross, which must for ever tower over the abyss of man's sin and is the bridge between man and God to whom he is reconciled.

AUSTIN OAKLEY

## ECONOMY

- 1 THE CANONICAL VIEW OF INTERCOMMUNION WITH THOSE NOT OF THE ORTHODOX FAITH.
- 2 PROBLEMS OF "ECCLESIASTICAL ECONOMY".  
In Greek. By DR J. I. KOTSONIS.

THESE two monographs of the Archimandrite Kotsonis, although treating the subject from different standpoints, are a study of great fulness of the whole problem of Economy from the strictly canonical point of view, and indeed are the application of the author's standpoint as a



canonist to what is likely to become a very important aspect of the Orthodox Church's handling of the whole problem of the reunion of Christendom.

It is necessary therefore to attempt some explanation of the Orthodox conception of "Economy", since it is foreign to normal western thinking. This task is not lightened by the fact that there are nuances of interpretation among the Orthodox themselves on the whole matter, which may well account for the author's determination to treat it from a strictly canonical and objective point of view.

In spite of the fact that the author (no doubt for reasons which appear cogent to him, or because he takes it for granted) has omitted any overt mention of the strictly theological basis of Economy, it is necessary for us to realize that that basis exists and is continually operative. Ecclesiastical Economy is surely ultimately the application to the life and ruling of the Church of the principles of the Divine Economy. Professor Alivisatos, in an unpublished study of the subject, has made that clear from the outset. This theological basis would seem too, to make less clear-cut the distinction—in Dr Kotsonis' treatment almost a dichotomy—between Economy and strictness and accuracy of its application. Economy, as a technical term, originally starts from strictness, yet covers both strictness of application of the Church's laws and a declension, condescension, and accommodation of strictness, a softening of Economy. There is doubtless an antinomy here, since "Economy" must provide for both strictness and accuracy and yet also for a flexibility that militates against the rigidity and ossification of the Law, since God wills all men to be saved. It is the abiding and majestic antinomy of the Justice and the Mercy of God.

To what extent therefore has the Orthodox Church, inflexible in her belief that there can be but one system of divine Grace, and that there can be no rival systems outside her, the power to loosen the strictness of application of that which has been handed down from the beginning, in particular cases and needs that call for that application, to further the salvation of the persons concerned, and the good of the whole Church, in such a way that strictness and accuracy are not damaged?

The answer would seem to be that the Orthodox Church has that power, and that the exercise of it, provided it is not against the declaration of any Ecumenical Council, covers and completes the particular anomaly or defect, and does not in any sense minimize the *normal* application of Strictness. To take concrete examples: It has been known for those in Roman Catholic, dissident Oriental (e.g. Armenian), and Anglican Orders, to have been received in them by the Orthodox Church by Chrismation or even after a formal declaration of faith or a *libellus fidei*. Similarly, of course, it has been known for lay people to be so received. But this does not imply any recognition *per se* of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Orders, and the rest that underlie the status of such persons received, or of the religious bodies to which they belong; but it does imply that the Church has the power to make her own that which before this act was not her own, to



complete that which until then was incomplete. On the other hand the decision by competent authority is applicable to each case only; any or all of the Sacraments may be considered as necessary *de novo*, since by definition, *conditional* reception of any such is excluded.

There is further a radical difference in treatment between those who remain heterodox and those who approach Orthodoxy to accede to her. It should be added that there is also a difference between the treatment of members of those churches which have an historical apostolic succession, and those who have not, and, one would hasten to say, for those who approach the Orthodox Church in the spirit of love and sympathetic understanding.

It cannot be doubted that by and large Dr Kotsonis in his general treatment would not object to the above attempt at statement. He has read, and that is clear from his quotations, our own literature on the subject, small as it is. He is familiar with Canon Douglas's *The Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox* (1921), (and indeed goes no farther in his treatment than does this most important book) as well as *Birkbeck and the Russian Church* and the invaluable Homiakov and Palmer correspondence. From these he has learnt of the startling exceptions at times of intercommunion and concelebration that took place between Anglicans and Orthodox (mostly overseas and in the U.S.A.), marking a period of great hope for *communio in sacris* on both sides, and rightly, on canonical grounds, condemns them.

He insists that any broad question of intercommunion cannot depend on the action of one Orthodox Church, or even several acting in concert. It is a matter which must be submitted to a general Council of the Orthodox Church without whose decisions local and sporadic and temporary enactments are without force. He divides (somewhat arbitrarily and summarily, one feels) the history of the application of Economy into four historical periods. The first is up to the schism of 1054—in itself a difficult date, since what happened then in so far as it was a breaking off of communion between Rome and Constantinople had happened more than once in the previous centuries, and even after 1054 was far from absolute and clear-cut and of universal application. But as a symbolic date it ends what he considers to be a period in which exactness and strictness was the ruling sense and application of economy. During the second period, from the eleventh to the eighteenth century, the whole of Orthodoxy was faced with an attempt forcibly to impose sacramental inter-communion from without, with special reference to Latin attempts to absorb Orthodoxy whenever contact was made. To combat this strictness was again necessary. In the third period, from the beginning of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, it was the non-Orthodox (e.g. Non-Jurors, Lutherans, and Anglicans) who sought Communion with the Orthodox. Finally and fourthly, for the last century sacramental intercommunion has been sought from both sides. It is in this period that "condescension", leniency, and the more popular conception of Economy has come to the fore.

It must be noted (and this is set out in detail in Dr Kotsonis's second monograph) that Economy has considerable width of application: not only to the Sacraments, and above all to the Eucharist, but to all relations of the Orthodox with non-Orthodox. While taking generally a strict and canonical attitude to any intercommunion of a temporary character that has received local and restricted recognition by the Orthodox, and reserving its due implementation to the decision of the whole Orthodox Church in Council, he recognizes the importance of fraternal action in all fields of co-operation where dogmatic principles are not involved. A distinction between Economy and *dispensatio* as now applied is also dealt with.

On the whole, it may be said that these books represent a more critical and severe attitude towards the whole problem of the application of Economy to intercommunion and reunion; a reaction, it may be said to the optimism and high hopes of thirty years ago in our own relations with the Orthodox Church, and a return to a more carefully considered attitude, at least of the Church of Greece, in the light of the Canons of the Orthodox Church, and their theological implications. That is not altogether a disadvantage. Meanwhile, the author's study is a copious and exhaustive one, and must always remain authoritative within the limits he has set himself. It remains to be seen to what extent his findings will be accepted by the whole Orthodox Church.

AUSTIN OAKLEY

### ANDREWES' PRAYERS

THE PRIVATE PRAYERS OF LANCELOT ANDREWES. Ed. by HUGH MARTIN. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

LANCELOT ANDREWES was a man of extraordinary scholarship and extraordinary piety. He knew fifteen languages, and was able to deal as an equal with Grotius and Casaubon, with Hooker and Du Moulin; but it is the life in Christ in which he lived and moved and had his being. This life was manifested in prayer that never ceased till, as he died, his lips finally ceased to move. His way of prayer found continual expression in detailed and most generous almsgiving and charity, shown as fully in his wide range of intercession as in his liberality to all sorts and conditions of men—old men, orphans and widows, mariners, prisoners, his former parishes, his College, his headmaster, his fellow-bishops. He walked with kings and the high elect of the Church and University, and never lost the common touch. It is striking to note how, in an age of bitter controversy, he won the praises both of the Puritan publisher, Michael Sparke, and of Archbishop Laud, to whom he gave a copy of his Prayers. He was a great friend of that brilliant chameleon, Francis Bacon, who said, "Amongst the men of to-day I hold you in

special reverence". And so it has continued across the centuries—people of different temperaments and different ways of thought have found themselves nourished and re-invigorated by him.

Andrewes brought to prayer all the riches he had. He was a translator of the Bible, and this is the main source of his prayers. It would, however, take a very widely-read scholar to detect all his allusions from the writings of eminent Christians and the storehouse of ancient liturgies. Andrewes was resolutely opposed to Romanism, and had long engagements with the famous Jesuit Bellarmine; but nevertheless an echo of the *Anima Christi*, that beautiful fourteenth-century prayer adopted by the Jesuits, resounds in one of his Friday prayers (page 65 in this edition). Yet here is no patchwork, but a noble tapestry in which all the varied threads are drawn together by a single design.

This grand design shows itself not merely in the progress of prayer through its necessary elements—praise, confession, prayer for grace, confession of faith, intercession—but also in the significance of the content, in which day by day the mysteries of creation and redemption are rehearsed and linked together. Andrewes was a man of melancholic temperament, but in these prayers this temperament and his own deeply humble perception of his failings are matched by a magnificent sense of God's mercy and over-ruling love.

The present selection of the *Preces Privatae*, ably edited by Dr Hugh Martin, falls into two parts: the first a translation from the Greek by Newman, and the second translated from Latin by Neale. Both Newman and Neale were poets, and so they are able not only to write with luminous clarity, but to suggest that inner music to which Andrewes himself always seemed to write in counterpoint. Here is one example of such writing:

The day is gone, and I give Thee thanks, O Lord. Evening is at hand, furnish it with brightness. As day has its evening, so also has life; the evening of life is age. Age has overtaken me, furnish it with brightness. . . . Abide with me, Lord, for it is towards evening, and the day is far spent of this fretful life. Let Thy strength be made perfect in my weakness.

Dr Martin's introduction to this edition is so good it might well be longer, and the form and printing of the prayers with a minimum of notes helps to avoid distraction. Since the original arrangement of words and lines (designed to show the movement of thought) has not generally been retained, it might be helpful for beginners if a few analytical notes on the contents and construction of some of the more difficult prayers were appended. As with closely woven music, a guide is sometimes needed in unravelling the various themes.

Absorbing and inspiring as the Prayers are in themselves, attracting such diverse characters as Herbert and Church, Tait and Pusey, perhaps their greatest influence has been in helping others, great and small, to make their own prayers as full and comprehensive as possible, springing from a true encounter with Christ, and finding in the Bible and in the

writings and worship of Christian people such a measure of expression as is allowed to human beings. Lancelot Andrewes would have rejoiced to think of all those people who would pray after him and with him and because of him; for all his private prayer, set against the majesty of creation, looks out perpetually on the wide horizons of the Christian commonwealth.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

### OLD FAVOURITE

THE COUNTRY PARSON AND SELECTED POEMS. By GEORGE HERBERT.  
S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

A FIRST glance at George Herbert's *The Country Parson* might give the impression that it is a somewhat quaint and old-fashioned work. Further study will however, reveal the deep sincerity and holiness of the writer, as well as the practical nature of much that he has to say.

Here may be discovered the ideal set by the rector of the little Wiltshire parish of Fuggleston-cum-Bemerton, near Salisbury, in an age when all too many clergy were content with low standards. Lest any reader should have doubts as to that ideal, the author states in his preface, that he intends to set it as high as he can, "since he shoots higher that threatens the moon, than he that aims at a tree".

It is not surprising that Herbert should lay particular stress on the care of and reverence for God's House, and on the responsibilities incumbent upon members of the laity, as well as upon the parish priest. What a shrewd observer of the ways of men was he who could write: "A man may be both covetous, and intemperate, and yet hear sermons against both, and himself condemn both in good earnest"; and again, concerning church-goers on Sundays: "It is easy for them to compose themselves to order, which they put on as their holy-day clothes, and come to church in frame, but commonly the next day put off both"!

Of the twenty-eight poems which have been selected for inclusion in this volume, four, "Antiphon", "Praise", "The 23rd Psalme", and "The Elixir", are familiar as hymns. The poem "Mattens" recalls Isaak Walton's reference to Herbert's custom of holding daily services in his church "at the canonical hours of ten and four"; whilst "Church-Musick" is a reminder of his love for music, which led to his twice-weekly journeys to Salisbury, in order to attend the Cathedral services.

One may wish that there had been included in this selection the poem "Affliction", containing the lines that record Herbert's discovery of his true vocation:

Whereas my birth and spirit rather took  
The way that takes the town,  
Thou didst betray me to a lingring book,  
And wrap me in a gown.



Reading this volume on a spring morning enabled one to appreciate once again its freshness. Like nature around, bursting forth into bud, Herbert's writing has a delightfully fresh beauty. It is equally fresh in the up-to-dateness of the message which it conveys.

*The Country Parson and Selected Poems* forms a welcome addition to the "Treasury of Christian Books". Dr Hugh Martin, the general editor of the series, has contributed a short introduction.

GORDON HUELIN

## COUNTRY CLERGY

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY COUNTRY PARSON. By A. TINDAL HART.  
Wilding & Son. 14s.

"THE eighteenth century Country Parson has his own peculiar niche in English History", says Dr Tindal Hart. Certainly, that is true as regards his predecessors. The seeker after a George Herbert in this gallery of pen-portraits will find his search a vain one; for, to his brother-priest of a hundred years later, anything approaching the deep spirituality of Herbert would have seemed to savour somewhat of that dreaded monster "enthusiasm", and there was the added risk that it might have resulted in his being mistaken for a "Methodist"! Surely, a parson's responsibilities were more than adequately discharged, if he remembered to urge upon his Sunday congregation the duty of thankfully enjoying the blessings received from a beneficent Creator, and of course, of keeping one's proper station in life?

Fitly, the author devotes some space to clerical diarists: men to whom later historians are deeply indebted for details of parochial life, as well as for numerous anecdotes. James Woodeforde of Weston Longueville, Benjamin Rogers of Carlton, William Jones of Broxbourne, William Cole of Bletchley, and—with the latitude which Dr Tindal Hart allows himself in the sub-title "circa 1689 to 1830"—John Skinner of Camerton, find a place in this volume.

It will be seen that the life of an eighteenth century country parson was not without its troubles. A difficult squire, or the vexed question of tithes, could completely disrupt parish harmony. There were, moreover, many cases of financial hardship and real poverty. Perhaps, however, one feels the deepest sympathy of all for the unfortunate children of the misguided rector who would discover upon their dressing-tables little inquisitorial notes left by their father, containing such questions as: "May I hope that you are a penitent?", and "This black border may remind you of your dear departed brother, but does his memory live in your heart for good?"

The second, and very much briefer section of Dr Tindal Hart's interesting book, contains some unpublished letters selected from the



correspondence of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, during the reign of Queen Anne. They have been included with the express design of throwing more light on the country parson of the period. That two of these letters are concerned with a dispute between a certain vicar and his churchwardens as to the provision of the sacramental bread and wine for Easter; and that the Archbishop himself had to be asked to order eight gallons of wine for the Easter Communion, shows that, if the eighteenth century country parson stood apart from his predecessors, he is even further removed from his successors.

GORDON HUELIN

### NEWMAN

NEWMAN, HIS LIFE AND SPIRITUALITY. By LOUIS BOUYER. Burns Oates. 30s.

PERE BOUYER'S book was originally published in France in 1955. Nevertheless in future bibliographies it should be considered as subsequent to the publication of Newman's own complete *Autobiographical Writings* in 1956, as these were known to the author as prepared for the public. This in itself would make the book a landmark, and it must be said at once that it is worthy of the occasion. Père Bouyer's mind is really discerning. His Huguenot background makes him an excellent interpreter of Newman's first conversion and of the penumbra of Evangelical pietism that surrounded his boyhood. He himself was converted to Roman Catholicism in mature life, and knows the ordeals of growth. He has written well on the positive aspects of the Reformation, and has at different times made many Anglican friends. Finally he is an Oratorian, as Newman was, and believes in his subject's sanctity with a passion which gives strength and weakness to this remarkable volume.

His strength is that he conceals nothing because nothing seems to him to need concealing. He has nothing but disdain for the discretion of "Anne Mozley's scissors". Nor does he share the intense embarrassment of Miss Maisie Ward, confronted with Newman's early journals, who found "a document as strange as anything in biography", revealing "a young monster",<sup>1</sup> if taken seriously. Her father, who must have seen them, shut them up and did not use them. The side of Newman that he himself found so profoundly distressing, that led him to write so many self-revelations, and destroy them, calling them "more or less a complaint from one end to the other", Miss Mozley found embarrassing, and all the Wards more or less distressing. To Père Bouyer it comes perfectly naturally. As a result of this he shows better than anyone else, the side of Newman that so many of his associates at all times found exasperating. Seeing the whole, those who themselves find that Newman

<sup>1</sup> *Young Mr Newman*, pp. 57-9. See *Autobiographical Writings*, p. 145.

brings out the worst in them, may be more patient with him and more severe with themselves. But when his cause comes up for canonization, I think the devil's advocate will find much useful matter in this volume.

To Newman's critics Père Bouyer is generally less than fair. "His father seems to have been a thoroughly typical example of the late eighteenth-century Englishman. In politics he was a Whig, and in religion enough of a free-lance to interest himself in Quaker literature, but, at the same time, too averse to "ticketing" himself, too impatient of "enthusiasm" of any kind, to profess himself a member of any particular religious body or sect" (p. 1-2). This last phrase might be the fault of the translator, but Mr Lewis May, who has himself written on Newman, must surely know that his father regarded himself, and was regarded, as an ordinary practising member of the Church of England. His patience in dealing with two brilliant and erratic sons reveal all the virtues of the species. In sharp contrast with English Roman Catholic laymen, like Wilfrid Ward who all his life conversed with ordinary Anglicans at his club, Père Bouyer shows a strange incomprehension of the middle-of-the-road in the Church of England, the more extraordinary because of the complete absence of any hostile animus. This want of understanding arises from putting himself so completely into Newman's own perspective. Newman came up to Oxford a tense, "enthusiastic", very strait-laced pietist, of the kind that Englishmen consider a prig. There he came to understand two types of academics, the Noetics and the patristic scholars around Routh. But he never outgrew his distaste for the ordinary Arminian, who in Evangelical eyes was on the way to unbelief by way of Liberalism. Seeking to justify to his French readers Newman's antagonism to Catholic emancipation, Père Bouyer assumes far too easily the objective truth of Tractarian judgements on Whig designs. He does not pause to consider the other side of the picture, for instance, in the Hampden case, where Newman certainly misrepresented Hampden's whole position and so alienated the intellectual integrity of F. D. Maurice.

It seems to me unfortunate that so much of this book should be devoted to Newman's youth and to the Oxford Movement, and so little to the great Oratorian whose mature wisdom in *The Grammar of Assent* and his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* is so far superior to the stilted denunciation of the *Essay on the Prophetic Office of the Church*. Apart from the sermons, where some will always find matter for meditation, only one of the Anglican works is still read for its own sake. Père Bouyer's admiration for the *Lectures on Justification* leads him to distort their argument. In later years indeed Newman could still agree in substance with the theology in this book, but it was certainly not intended as a defence of the Council of Trent. Nor was it a very original work. The expression indeed is Newman's own, at the height of his preaching powers, but a good deal of the substance is Bishop Bull's.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

## RELIGION AND REVOLUTION

FRENCH PROTESTANTISM AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By BURDETTE C. POLAND. Princeton University Press. 40s.

THIS learned American monograph surveys in some detail the history of French Protestantism between 1685 and 1815. To an Englishman, the French Protestants after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes invite comparison with the English Dissenters after the Toleration Act of 1689.

Although the Regency promised at first some relief from the severities which had been launched by Louis XIV, his persecuting edicts remained in force, and were codified afresh in 1724. Protestants were suffering as galley slaves at Toulon till 1775. The tolerating edict of 1788 allowed Protestants to marry, to be buried, and to bequeath their estates outside the Catholic Church in France by the use of civil functionaries, but they still had no right of public worship, and their pastors were not legally recognized. Their disabilities were thus the opposite of those laid upon the English Dissenters, who could worship together publicly, but had difficulties over marriages and burials.

Some of Dr Poland's most moving pages describe the efforts of Antoine Court and the few other men who kept Protestantism alive in the years of persecution, in what came to be called the Church of the Desert. These were simple peasants, quite unlike the dignified Dissenting divines in England, who founded academies for general as well as theological education. Perhaps the men of the Desert were most like (in English religion) the rural Baptists of the midland counties. During the century, as the prosperous Protestant *bourgeois* of the towns found it safe to give up an outward conformity to Catholicism, differences arose between them and the men of the Desert, who hoped to establish a strict control of the pastors by local consistories. This was uncongenial to the town ministers, of whom indeed in 1772 there were some who cast doubt on the parity of ministers. Later there was even talk (vague enough) of hierarchy and episcopacy. The Protestants of Paris seemed to aim at as preponderating a voice in the political counsels of French Protestantism, as the Protestant Dissenters of London and around for long enjoyed in the affairs of English Dissent. By the time the Revolution came, French Protestantism was thus greatly weakened by social fissures and disagreements about polity.

Unable to meet for public worship, French Protestants became satisfied with a *culte de famille*. Liturgically destitute therefore, and theologically barren, they had slight resistance to the secularism of the Enlightenment. Protestants as such had indeed no very significant part in the Revolution. This book conclusively refutes the suggestions, made from the beginning, that Calvinism was the secret spring of revolution. Protestant grievances appear in the *cahiers de doléances* only most infrequently. Protestants and Roman Catholics co-operated happily in celebrating the first achievements of the Revolution. The Declaration of



the Rights of Man expressly avoided any assertion that equality of religions was a natural right. Only one Protestant was at all active in the debates on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. In the crisis of de-Christianization there were Catholic martyrs. There was practically no Protestant resistance. The Protestant Boissy d'Anglas welcomed the edict of 1795 establishing an equality of religions in the spirit but without the wit of the Englishman Gibbon. At last in 1802 French Protestants secured full recognition from the State, as part of Napoleon's general religious settlement, but only at the cost of subservience to government. Moreover there was involved the establishment of a polity which secured as dominant the influence of wealthy lay oligarchies in the towns, and was out of line with the disciplinary aspirations which had inspired the Church of the Desert.

R. W. GREAVES

## LIVES OF SAINTS

A BOOK OF BRITISH SAINTS. By N. V. PIERCE BUTLER. Faith Press. 8s. 6d.

IN VIEW of the discussions concerning the Prayer Book Kalendar and the recognition of local saints, which are to take place at the forthcoming Lambeth Conference, Miss Norah Butler's book on the saints of the British Isles is timely.

As she herself points out in her Foreword, the subject presents certain difficulties as regards treatment. Her own method, of dividing the book into chapters each of which deals with the saints of a particular county or area, suffers from the defect of giving a rather disjointed pattern. Thus, while on one page we find ourselves in the year 1247, on the next, we are back in the sixth century.

To historians, moreover, the amount of space devoted to legends and fairy-tale traditions will seem over-weighted in comparison with that given to the important achievements of many of these holy men and women. It is strange, too, that no place should have been found for Alfred, King of the West Saxons, who was deemed worthy of inclusion in the Kalendar of the 1928 Prayer Book.

Perhaps the book will be of most value to Sunday School teachers, who should find it helpful in illustrating their lessons from the examples and anecdotes it contains.

There are some mistakes: it was *Restitutus*, not *Restitutus* (p. 1), who was Bishop of London at the time of the Council of Arles in 314; the monastery of St Maglorius (p. 87) was not in Jersey, but in the neighbouring smaller Channel Island of Sark; whilst a journey undertaken by St Willibrord in the year 651 (p. 89), would be even more miraculous than are some of the legends which Miss Butler records, since this great missionary saint did not see the light of day until 657 or 658!

GORDON HUELIN

## RELIGIOUS LEADERS

ATHLETES OF THE SPIRIT. By PHILIP W. LILLEY. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

GLANCING at the names which appear on the page of contents in Mr Lilley's recent book, one may perhaps be pardoned for asking, in a flight of the imagination, the question: "What would these nine men have had to say to one another, had they been able to meet in real life?" A resolute Covenanter like Samuel Rutherford, and a Nonjuror such as was William Law; a devout churchman as St Augustine, and a convinced dissenter like John Bunyan, or a detester of the "steeple-house" like John Woolman; the cloistered Thomas à Kempis, and the outdoor evangelist John Wesley; the robust Englishman Thomas Browne, and the delicate Frenchman Blaise Pascal—here, brought together under one cover, are nine characters, individually so different in temperament and outlook, yet all striving after the same goal.

An athlete may be defined as "one who by special training acquires great strength". In each of the writings of these "athletes of the spirit" as selected and expounded by Mr Lilley, we have an indication as to wherein that spiritual strength lies.

Thus, the *Letters* of Rutherford stress the love of Christ, that "all-enthraling concern" of his heart, while Law's particular concern in the *Serious Call* is to show the importance of prayer. If St Augustine's *Confessions* serve as a reminder of the "helpful influence which the fellowship of the Christian community exerts upon the needy and struggling individual", Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* portrays Christian with Bible in hand, and Woolman in his *Journal* emphasizes the need of the surrender of the human will to that of God. A reading of the *Imitation of Christ* reveals à Kempis's devotion for the Holy Communion, just as a perusal of the celebrated *Journal* shows Wesley's re-discovery of the power of the Holy Spirit. Finally, if Browne's *Religio Medici* gives a warning of the necessity to ponder from time to time over the four last things, "those four inevitable points of us all", Pascal's *Thoughts* bring out the need of continually placing oneself quietly in God's Presence.

It is no easy task to break fresh ground where so many scholars and writers have toiled before, but Mr Lilley has certainly succeeded in his aim of not merely giving an account of a number of well-known Christian classics, but of applying their messages to the spiritual problems and particular tasks of our own day.

GORDON HUELIN